

CONFIDENTIAL

(8667.)

ef

PART IV.

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

A F F A I R S O F P E R S I A.

October to December 1905.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
1	Mr. E. Grant Duff	120 Tel.	Oct. 1, 1905	Russian claims at Meshed. Repeats telegrams to and from Meshed respecting inquiry into	1
2	"	122 Tel.	1,	Landing of Persian refugees from Russia at Persian ports. Reports ..	1
3	"	123 Tel.	2,	M. Naus. Agitation against him. Departure for Constantinople to negotiate Commercial Treaty with Porte ..	2
4	Sir C. Hardinge	578 Confidential	Sept. 29,	Seistan Water Award. Conversation with Persian Minister. Probability that Award will be accepted on arrival of Shah at Tehran ..	2
5	India Office	"	Oct. 4,	Seistan Water Award. Transmits telegram from Viceroy dated 3rd October. Requests that pressure be put on the Shah to induce him to accept the Award ..	3
6	Sir C. Hardinge	188 Tel.	4,	Riots at Meshed. Refers to No. 4. Persian Government has refused to pay indemnity for losses sustained by Russian subjects during recent riots. Danger of Russian troops entering Meshed if disturbances were renewed ..	3
7	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	148	4,	Persian loan. Conversation with Persian Minister. Grand Vizier has accepted all conditions attached to loan by His Majesty's Government, and hopes that it may be increased to 300,000 <i>l.</i> ..	4
8	"	68 Tel.	5,	Persian loan. Refers to No. 7. Conditions attached to loan by His Majesty's Government have been accepted by Grand Vizier. Persian Government hopes that loan may be increased to 300,000 <i>l.</i> This will probably prove impracticable ..	4
9	To Sir C. Hardinge	300	5,	Anglo-Russian relations. Conversation with Russian Ambassador. Count Benckendorff considers the Persian question to be the only one offering serious difficulties between the two Powers ..	4
10	Mr. E. Grant Duff	125 Tel.	6,	Persian loan. Telegram to India. Would it be possible to insist on payment of various claims as condition of ? ..	5
11	"	126 Tel.	6,	Urmil murder trials. Steps taken to prevent intimidation of witnesses ..	5
12	"	128 Tel.	9,	Entry of Turkish troops into Vazneh. Request for assistance of His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople ..	5
13	Sir C. Hardinge	596	6,	Seistan Water Award. Refers to No. 4. Transmits extract from "Journal de Saint-Petersbourg" denying that Russian intrigue was responsible for difficulties encountered by Commission ..	5
14	Persian Transport Company	"	9,	Bakhtiari road. Transmits Report on condition of by Mr. Parry ..	6
15	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	144	10,	Seistan Water Award. Refers to No. 102, Part III. Approves terms of note addressed by Sir C. Hardinge to Persian Government on urging their acceptance of the Award ..	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

iii

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
16	Mr. E. Grant Duff	129 Tel.	Oct. 11, 1905	Arms for Meshed. Has received note detailing measures taken by Persian Government to preserve order, and stating that importation of arms would arouse public excitement ..	11
17	To Sir C. Hardinge	309 Confidential	11,	Seistan Arbitration Award. Refers to No. 4. Approves language held by his Excellency to Persian Minister <i>re</i> ..	12
18	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	145	11,	Withdrawal of British Consular guards. Refers to No. 68, Part III. His Majesty's Government see no reason to modify view already expressed ..	12
19	Mr. E. Grant Duff	130 Tel.	12,	Majid-es-Saltaneh. Refers to No. 12, Part III. Is still in asylum at His Majesty's Consulate-General at Tabreez. Shah refuses to sanction his journey to Europe. Suggests that he be appointed Munshi to His Majesty's Consulate and sent across the frontier ..	12
20	"	131 Tel.	12,	Urmil case. Refers to No. 12, Part III. Persian Government refuse to carry out promise to send Mollah to Meshed or Tehran. Importance of his removal from Tabreez before opening of inquiry at Urmil ..	12
21	Memorandum by the War Office	"	12,	Proposed improvements in North Persian roads, &c. ..	13
22	Mr. E. Grant Duff	132 Tel.	13,	Seistan Water Award. Maps, &c., have been sent to Persian Minister in London, who will explain objections of Seistan inhabitants to the Award. ..	13
23	India Office	"	16,	Arms for protection of Meshed and Seistan Consulates. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 14th October respecting. Urging action as recommended in his telegram of 10th September ..	15
24	To Sir F. Bertie	662	17,	Anglo-Russian relations. Count Lamsdorff desires of a <i>rapprochement</i> . Relations in Persia and Afghanistan ..	16
25	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	71 Tel. Confidential	18,	Urmil. Refers to Nos. 19 and 20. His Majesty's Government must insist on Persian Government carrying out promise to remove Mollah. Persian Government should be pressed to sanction the departure of Majid-es-Saltaneh for Europe. ..	16
26	"	146	18,	Turco-Persian frontier. Transmits copy of telegram received by Persian Minister from Mushir-es-Dowleh respecting Turkish protest against military force being sent to Lahijan. Desires information <i>re</i> ..	17
27	"	73 Tel.	20,	Arms for Meshed. Should press Persian Government to allow import of arms for protection of Consulate ..	17
28	"	147	20,	Ahwaz-Ispahan road. Refers to No. 14. Transmits letter from Persian Transport Company, dated 9th October, relative to proposed contribution from Bakhtiari Chiefs for repairs to ..	18
29	Mr. E. Grant Duff	154 Tel.	21,	Situation at Urmil. Refers to No. 25. Danger of removing the Mollah and the Majid-es-Saltaneh. Suggests that question of removing Majid-es-Saltaneh might be dropped if Persian Government would promise to keep him at Tabreez ..	18

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
30	Sir N. O'Connor ..	721	Oct. 17, 1905	Turkish troops in Vazneh. Refers to No. 12. Reviews history of Turco-Persian boundary ..	19
31	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	74 Tel.	25,	Urumia. He should endeavour to obtain permission Majid to leave Persia ..	19
32	To India Office	25,	Attack on Colonel Douglas and Major Lorimer. Refers to No. 75, Part III. Transmits Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 177. and proposes to concur ..	20
33	" "	25,	Status of Bahreinis in Persia. Transmits No. 103, Part III. Proposes to instruct Mr. Grant Duff to persuade Persian Government to allow Resident at Bushire to use his good offices on behalf of ..	20
34	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	136 Tel.	26,	Urum case. Repeats telegram from Consul-General Wratislaw. Kurds arrived at Urum in complete liberty. Will decline to attend proceedings unless they are kept under arrest ..	21
35	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	75 Tel.	26,	Urumia. Refers to No. 34. To concert with United States' Minister in representations to Persian Government ..	21
36	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	389	27,	Turkish troops in Persia. Refers to No. 30. Approves proposed course ..	21
37	India Office	28,	Kashmiris in Kernashah. Refers to No. 121. Part III. Question of their protection ..	21
38	Sir C. Hardinge ..	539 Confidential	24,	Anglo-Russian relations. Question of Persia. Audience of the Emperor ..	22
39	Persian Transport Company	31,	Bakhtiari road. Reports outrages on. Trusts His Majesty's Government will make strong representations to Persian Government ..	23
40	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	138 Tel.	Nov. 1,	Kukah buildings. Has received telegram from His Majesty's Consul at Seistan reporting their destruction by fire by order of the Yamin-i-Nizam ..	24
41	" " ..	139 Tel.	1,	Kukah buildings. Mushir-ul-Dowleh states that destruction of buildings was due to a misunderstanding. Hopes that His Majesty's Government will make strong representations to Persian Government ..	24
42	India Office	1,	Attack on Colonel Douglas and Major Lorimer. Refers to No. 32. Concurs in proposed instructions to Mr. Grant Duff ..	25
43	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	77 Tel.	2,	Demonstration of Seistan Commission buildings. Refers to Nos. 40 and 41. Indignation of His Majesty's Government ..	25
44	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	142 Tel.	5,	Arms for Meshed. Refers to No. 27. Has received note from Persian Government requesting His Majesty's Government not to press the matter as likely to prejudice result of negotiations proceeding with Russians for removal of arms imported by them ..	25
45	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	80 Tel.	5,	Attack on Colonel Douglas and Major Lorimer. Refers to No. 75*, Part III. Further efforts should be made to secure more culprits ..	25
46	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	211	5,	Bakhtiari road. Transmits correspondence with Messrs. Lynch ..	26
47	" " ..	212 Confidential	5,	Agitation against M. Nuss. Refers to No. 2. Comments on His departure for Constantinople ..	29

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
48	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	213 Confidential	Oct. 5, 1905	Anti-British demonstration at Bunjar. Transmits letter describing origin of ..	30
49	" " ..	214 Confidential	8,	Urumia murder case. Refers to No. Transmits correspondence respecting present position of case ..	31
50	" " ..	215	9,	Persians at Baku. Arrival of refugees in North Persia. Dangers of an anti-Christian outbreak ..	41
51	" " ..	216 Confidential	9,	Seistan Water Award. Transmits letter to Mushir-ul-Dowleh urging acceptance of ..	43
52	" " ..	217	10,	Entry of Turkish troops into Vazneh. Transmits note from Persian Government respecting, and asking for assistance of His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople ..	45
53	" " ..	218	10,	Fearful disturbances in Azerbaijan. Refers to No. 50. Transmits despatch from Tabreez respecting ..	47
54	" " ..	219	10,	Arms for Meshed. Refers to No. 97, Part III. Transmits correspondence with Persian Government ..	48
55	" " ..	223	11,	Monthly summary. Transmits ..	50
56	" " ..	224	11,	Arms for Meshed Consulate. Transmits note from Persian Government refusing to allow import of, but offering to furnish garrison ..	53
57	India Office	Nov. 4,	Bahreinis in Persia. Refers to No. 33. Concurs in proposed instructions to Mr. Grant Duff ..	54
58	Memorandum communicated to Persian Minister	7,	Turkish troops in Vazneh. Refers to No. 12. Suggests direct communication with His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople ..	54
59	To India Office	8,	Arms for Meshed Consulate. Refers to No. 44. Proposes not to press question at present ..	54
60	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	81 Tel.	10,	Status of Bahreinis in Persia. Refers to No. 57. His Majesty's Government cannot recognize Persian claims to Bahrein ..	55
61	India Office	11,	Kukah buildings. Transmits telegram from Viceroy dated 10th November. Suggests construction of Rohat-Naratabad telegraph line as reparation to be demanded from Persian Government ..	55
62	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	146 Tel.	12,	Kukah buildings. Refers to No. 41. Has received understanding from Persian Government to re-erect buildings if required, but no apology for their destruction. Omission of Shah's Representative to visit the Legation on the King's birthday ..	55
63	" " ..	147 Tel.	13,	King's birthday incident. Refers to No. 62. Has received an apology from Persian Government ..	56
64	" " ..	149 Tel.	14,	Attack on Captain Gough. Has received telegram from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez asking what punishment His Majesty's Government required to be inflicted on his assailants ..	56
65	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	82 Tel.	15,	Attack on Captain Gough. Refers to No. 64. Imprisonment for life should be demanded as punishment for his assailants ..	56

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
66	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	159	Nov. 15, 1905	Rumour as to Anglo-Russian Agreement. Persian Minister inquires as to truth of ..	56
67	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	150 Tel.	16,	Bahreinis. Refers to No. 60. Sultan declines to allow British intervention on their behalf. Desirability of settling question. Persian Minister in London will be instructed to enter into direct communication with Lord Lansdowne on the subject ..	57
68	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	88 Tel.	16,	<i>Kukah</i> . Kukah buildings. Public apology must be insisted on for destruction of. Representations will be made to Persian Minister ..	57
69	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	151 Tel.	17,	Seistan Water Award. His Majesty's Consul at Seistan reports that letter has been sent by the Yamin-i-Nizam to the Afghan Governor stating that as Award has been refused by Persian Government Persia reverts to <i>status quo ante</i> as laid down in Goldsmid Award ..	57
70	" "	153 Tel.	18,	Kukah buildings. Asks whether apologies from Seistan officials would be considered sufficient reparation. Suggests using incident to obtain telegraph extension to Kuh-i-Malik Siab ..	57
71	" "	154 Tel.	18,	Motor-cars in Persia. Hears that a Company is to be formed for running of service between Tehran, Kura, and Kermanshah, and between Tehran and Meshed ..	58
72	India Office	" "	18,	Arms for Meshed. Concurs in opinion that it is not necessary to further press the matter ..	58
73	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	155 Tel.	20,	Condition of Shiraz and Fars. Outbreak of riots owing to misrule of the Shah's second son ..	58
74	" "	157 Tel.	22,	Anti-Jewish riots at Shiraz. Refers to No. 73. Complaint by Mushir-ed-Dowleh against action of His Majesty's Consul in collecting Jewish women and children into his house and setting a guard of Indian sowars over it ..	59
75	India Office	" "	22,	Persian telegraphs. Transmits telegram from Viceroy dated 22nd November. Repairs of Kain-Seistan line about to be commenced by Russians ..	59
76	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	158 Tel.	23,	Financial situation. Grand Vizier has attempted to borrow 40,000 <i>l.</i> from the Imperial Bank for his private use. Directors replied that outstanding debt owed by Persian Government must first be repaid ..	60
77	India Office	" "	23,	Kukah buildings. Calls attention to a telegram from the Viceroy dated 10th November ..	60
78	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	159 Tel.	24,	Situation in Fars. Refers to No. 74. Grand Vizier has admitted to Oriental Secretary the deplorable state of the province ..	60
79	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	160	24,	Situation in Shiraz. Conversation with Persian Minister. Protest against Mr. Graham's action ..	60
80	Mr. Spring-Rice ..	658	14,	Railway construction in Persia. Statement in "Slovo" that the railway to Julfa will be open to through traffic next year. Conversation with Persian Minister, who complained of the prohibition on railway construction ..	61
81	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	160 Tel.	27,	Russian Bank. Reports destruction of branch of by the mob ..	62

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
82	India Office	" "	Nov. 28, 1905	Seistan Water Award. Transmits copy of telegram from Viceroy dated 27th November. Attitude of the Ameer towards the Award ..	62
83	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	161 Tel.	29,	Grand Vizier. Mushir-ed-Dowleh stated in private interview with the Oriental Secretary that he considered Grand Vizier's fall imminent ..	63
84	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	88 Tel.	29,	Kukah buildings. Refers to No. 70. Demand for re-erection will not be pressed if Kuh-i-Malik-Siab telegraph extension is granted ..	63
85	" "	89 Tel.	29,	Condition of Shiraz and Fars. To call attention to. If no improvement in His Majesty's Government will take their own measures—e.g., cavalry escort for caravans ..	63
86	India Office	" "	30,	Seistan Water Award. Refers to No. 69. Concurs in terms of telegram to Mr. Grant Duff instructing him to ask Persian Government whether Yamen was acting under their orders, and, if not, to request that he be instructed to withdraw his communication to the Afghans ..	64
87	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	162 Tel.	30,	Anti-Christian agitation at Yazd. Transmits telegram from His Majesty's Vice-Consul reporting that a leading Mujtahed is preaching against the Christians ..	64
88	" "	164 Tel.	Dec. 1,	Financial situation. Grand Vizier requires a loan of 800,000 <i>l.</i> , and states that he will apply to Russia if His Majesty's Government are not prepared to make the advance ..	65
89	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	91 Tel.	1,	Seistan Water Award. Proper course for Persia to adopt is to represent objections to His Majesty's Government ..	65
90	India Office	" "	2,	Persian telegraphs. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 1st December. Alleged arrangements for posting Russian official at Sabzwar ..	66
91	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	166 Tel.	2,	Situation at Yazd. Refers to No. . All quiet now. His Majesty's Vice-Consul suggests removal to Tehran of the offending Mullah ..	66
92	To India Office	" "	2,	Seistan Water Award. Refers to No. 86. Concurs in terms of telegram sent to Viceroy ..	67
93	India Office	" "	5,	Seistan Water Award. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 4th December. Refers to No. 92. Informs of instructions to Mr. Grant Duff ..	67
94	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	168 Tel.	6,	Yezd. Situation normal. School reopens 6th December ..	68
95	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	170	7,	King's birthday incident. Kukah buildings. Representations to Persian Minister. Due to misunderstanding ..	68
96	" "	93 Tel.	8,	Kukah buildings. Refers to No. 93. Conversation with Persian Minister. Destruction of buildings due to a misunderstanding. Apology for King's birthday incident ..	68
97	India Office	" "	8,	Seistan Water Award. Transmits telegram from Viceroy dated 8th December. Friction between Afghans and Persians ..	69

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
98	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	169 Tel.	Dec. 9, 1905	Persian loan. Transmits telegram to Government of India. Trusts that condition of loan will be settlement of British claims ..	69
99	" ..	170 Tel.	9,	Seistan telegraph line. Transmits telegrams from and to Consul at Seistan. Measures proposed for preventing Russian control of line. ..	69
100	India Office ..	" ..	11,	Seistan Water Award. Transmits letter from Government of India dated 10th December calling attention to the danger of Afghan feeling being aroused by the action of the Persian Government ..	70
101	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	172 Tel.	11,	Urumia (see No. 111). Majid-es-Sultaneh has received Shah's permission to leave ..	70
102	" ..	173 Tel.	13,	Riot at Tehran. Caused by feeling against Shah and Grand Vizier. ..	71
103	" ..	174 Tel.	14,	Post-offices in Persian Gulf. Has not yet received reply of Mr. Naas concerning ..	71
104	" ..	175 Tel.	15,	Herjan telegraph station. Has been informed by Mushir-ed-Dowleh that Concession makes no mention of land ..	71
105	" ..	227	Oct. 18,	Resumption of work on Julla-Labreez road. Reports by Russians. Proposed institution of motor-car service ..	71
106	" ..	231	Nov. 2,	Bakhtiari road. Disturbed condition of country through which it runs. Suggests the formation of road-guards under British officers ..	72
107	" ..	233	3,	Arms for Meshed. Refers to No. 27. Transmits copy of note addressed to Persian Government 24. No answer yet received ..	74
108	" ..	236	4,	Turco-Persian frontier. Refers to No. 52. Seriousness of the dispute. Transmits correspondence concerning ..	74
109	" ..	237	1,	Province of Fars. State of anarchy is due to the misrule of the Shoa-es-Sultaneh ..	75
110	" ..	238	5,	Urmi murder case. Refers to No. 49. Expatriates on, and transmits correspondence. Action of United States' Minister ..	79
111	" ..	239	5,	Urmi Mujtehed and Majid-es-Sultaneh. Refers to No. 19. Difficulties in the way of Persian Government fulfilling their promise regarding. Has agreed to solve the difficulty as proposed in No. 29 ..	88
112	" ..	241	6,	Arms for Meshed. Refers to No. 107. Persian Government still refuses to sanction importation of. Urges necessity of British subjects having some means of defending themselves ..	90
113	" ..	242	7,	Persian subjects at Baku. Refusal of Russian Government to compensate Persians for losses at Baku has induced the Shah to issue a Circular disclaiming responsibility for losses suffered by foreigners in Persia ..	91
114	" ..	243	7,	Kukab buildings. Refers to No. 43. Transmits copy of note from Mushir-ed-Dowleh undertaking to re-erect the buildings if they should be hereafter required ..	91
115	" ..	245	8,	Seistan Crown lands. Grand Vizier denies that the lands have been sold ..	92

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
116	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	247	Nov. 14, 1905	King's birthday incident. Refers to No. 62. Transmits apology from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh ..	93
117	" ..	248	17,	Monthly summary. Transmits ..	95
118	Nil.				
119	Nil.				
120	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	176 Tel.	Dec. 16,	Persian loan. Refers to No. 88. Has been informed by Grand Vizier that Persian Government will be compelled to contract loan with Russian Government unless His Majesty's Government make an advance. Has obtained paper signed by Shah agreeing to pay 750,000 tomans to Imperial Bank in two months ..	98
121	Sir N. O'Connor ..	914	12,	Turco-Persian frontier. Refers to No. 30. Serious nature of the dispute. Dispatch of Turkish reinforcements ..	99
122	India Office ..	" ..	18,	Arms for Meshed. Transmits telegram from Viceroy dated 18th December requesting permission to send arms to Koh-i-Malik Shah ..	99
123	Sir N. O'Connor ..	214 Tel.	18,	Turco-Persian frontier. Ottoman agrees to appointment of Mixed Commission, but refuses to withdraw troops ..	100
124	India Office ..	" ..	19,	Seistan Water Award. Russo-Afghan relations. Ameer's letter of 2nd November respecting ..	100
125	" ..	" ..	19,	Meshed-Seistan telegraph. Transmits telegram from Viceroy dated 18th December suggesting that line be divided for purposes of repairs between British and Russians ..	103
126	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	172	20,	Disturbances in Fars. Refers to No. 109. Approves terms of note addressed to Mushir-ed-Dowleh re the maltreatment of a witness at Shiraz ..	103
127	India Office ..	" ..	20,	Consular guards. Suggests measures for treating cost of. Requests views of Sir E. Grey ..	104
128	To Mr. E. Grant Duff	173	21,	Persians at Baku. Refers to No. 113. Approves language ..	104
129	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	178 Tel.	22,	Disturbances at Shiraz. Repeats telegram sent to Government of India. Desirability of demanding removal of Governor-General of Fars. Proposes to instruct His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire to send Indian infantry guard to Shiraz in case of renewal of disorder ..	104
129*	To Persian Transport Company	" ..	22,	Kum-Ispahan road. Discusses alternative routes. His Majesty's Government will support Company in their proposals ..	104*
130	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	179 Tel.	22,	Unrest in Persia. Repeats telegram sent to Government of India. Suggests increase of Legation guard to fifty men ..	105
131	" ..	250	2,	Recruiting of Berberis. Protests against action of Government of India instructing Major Sykes to take this action without consulting His Majesty's Legation ..	105

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
132	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	251	Dec. 2, 1905	Consular guards. Refers to No. 18. Transmits note to Persian Government stating that His Majesty's Government would be unable to withdraw guards even if Russian Government agreed to do so ..	109
133	" " ..	252 Confidential	2,	Destruction of Russian Bank. Transmits Memorandum by Acting Oriental Secretary on a conversation with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh concerning the state of public opinion in Persia ..	110
134	" " ..	250	3,	Province of Fars. Refers to No. 109. Anarchy in. Anti-Jewish riots at Shiraz. Cruelty and incapacity of the Shoa-es-Sultaneh as Governor ..	111
135	" " ..	255	4,	Urmí murder case. Refers to No. 110. No progress has been made towards settlement of. Inactivity of United States' Minister ..	120
136	" " ..	256	5,	Insecurity of South Persian caravan routes. Refers to No. 85. Transmits copy of note to Atabeg Azam ..	127
137	" " ..	257	5,	Seistan Water Award. Refers to No. 89. Transmits copy of note to Persian Government concerning the action of the Yamen-i-Nizam ..	128
138	" " ..	258	5,	Attack on Colonel Douglas. Refers to No. 45. Does not think that Persian Government intends to take further steps for the arrest of the Lurs implicated in ..	128
139	" " ..	259	5,	Kukah buildings. Refers to No. 34. Transmits copy of note addressed to Persian Government re apology for destruction of ..	130
140	" " ..	261	7,	Monthly summary. Transmits ..	130
141	" " ..	262	7,	Status of Bahrainis. Refers to No. 67. Bahrain claimed by the Shah as part of his dominions. Uselessness of further discussion ..	134
142	" " ..	263	7,	Majid-es-Sultaneh and Agha Mirza Hassan. Refers to No. 111. Persian Government guarantee that the Majid-es-Sultaneh shall not be molested and that the Majhehd shall remain at Tabbreez ..	135
143	" " ..	265	8,	Island of Kishm. Rumour current in South Persia that the Russians have obtained a long lease of. No reason to believe that there is any truth in the story ..	136
144	Mr. Spring-Rice ..	772	16,	Financial situation. Refers to No. 88. Conversation with Persian Minister. No immediate necessity for a loan ..	137
145	India Office	23,	Proposed further Persian loan. Transmits telegram from Viceroy dated 22nd December. Government of India is not prepared to make loan without further political and commercial concessions ..	138
146	To India Office	23,	Legation guard at Tehran. Transmits No. 130 recommending increase of and suggesting communication to Government of India ..	138
147	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	180 Tel.	24,	Shiraz. Situation at. Governor-General will not return ..	139

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
148	Sir N. O'Connor ..	921 Secret	Dec. 18, 1905	Turco-Persian frontier. Refers to No. 121. Transmits despatch from Colonel Surtees reporting movement of Turkish troops towards the frontier ..	140
149	" " ..	924	18,	Turco-Persian frontier. Refers to No. 142. Conversation with Persian Minister concerning negotiations with the Porte ..	139
150	India Office	28,	Henjam telegraph. Transmits telegram from Government of India stating that information has been received from Mr. Grant Duff that facts of possession between 1808 and 1880 are not disputed ..	141
151	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	181 Tel.	26,	Turco-Persian frontier. Refers to No. 121. Persian Government are willing to accept proposed arrangement provided disputed territory is first evacuated by Turkish troops ..	141
152	" " ..	182 Tel	27,	Unrest of Persia. Repeats telegram sent to Government of India. No further steps for sending guard to Tehran necessary at present ..	142
153	To India Office	28,	Protection of British subjects in Persia. Refers to No. 152. Recommends that Mr. Grant Duff should be instructed to concert with Government of India ..	142
154	Communication from the Persian Minister	28,	Shiraz. Telegram from Mushir-ed-Dowleh. Protests against interference of British Consul ..	142
155	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	181	28,	Shiraz disturbances. Conversation with Persian Minister. Persian Government hope that British troops will not be sent to Shiraz ..	143
156	Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	183 Tel.	28,	Province of Fars. Refers to No. 147. Heads of Mission at Tehran have received telegram from people of Shiraz enumerating their grievances and begging foreign Representatives to lay them before Shah ..	143
157	" " ..	186 Tel.	30,	Kukah buildings. Refers to No. 96. Learns that His Majesty's Consul in Seistan has not yet received an apology. Hopes that His Majesty's Government will insist on full apology by Governor and persons guilty of burning the buildings ..	143
158	" " ..	187 Tel.	31,	Arms for Meshed. Persian Government will certainly refuse to allow passage of arms across the frontier. Suggests that in case of necessity they be sent direct to Meshed ..	144
159	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	185	31,	Turco-Persian frontier. Refers to No. 149. Approves language ..	144
160	To Mr. E. Grant Duff ..	182	31,	Urmia murders. Refers to No. 135. Approves action ..	144

ERRATUM.

Page 16, No. 29, line 3. For " No. 7 of the 18th instant " read " No. 71."

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Persia.

PART IV.

No. 1.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 1.)

(No. 120.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 1, 1905.

THE following telegram has been received from His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed:—

"I am informed by Governor-General that he has received instructions to settle claims arising from recent riots at Meshed with the Russian Chargé d'Affaires.

"This is an admirable mode of stirring up excitement in Meshed, if this be the wish of the Russian Minister; but the lives and property of all Christians will be thereby endangered, apart from its injustice.

"I venture to suggest that the claims should be paid at Tehran, and the money be recovered when the excitement here has subsided, as the present course is most impolitic.—(Signed) SYKES."

I have sent the following telegram to Major Sykes in reply, and have repeated it to the Government of India:—

"I am informed by Minister for Foreign Affairs that Russians are urging Persian Government to pay their claims at Meshed, and the sole means of avoiding this is to point out that the real aggressors were Russian Armenians. The Shah and Grand Vizier have sent instructions to Governor-General at Khorassan that an inquiry should be held.

"I have requested Grand Vizier by telegraph that at all events the inquiry may be postponed until the present excitement has quieted down, and have represented danger not only of riots, but of the Russians carrying out the threat, which they have made officially to the Persian Government, of sending troops to Meshed in the event of disorders.

"I think that Mushir-ed-Dowleh imagines that Governor-General wishes to postpone inquiry for reasons of his own, and has brought his influence to bear upon you with this object.—(Signed) GRANT DUFF."

No. 2.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 1.)

(No. 122.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 1, 1905.

HIS Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez reports that, though the situation at Ardebil is serious, all is quiet at the former place. Some 9,000 refugees from Baku have been permitted to land at Persian ports in spite of my warning.

No. 3.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 2.)

(No. 123.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

FOLLOWING sent to Government of India:—

Tehran, October 2, 1905.

The Minister of Customs, M. Naus, leaves to-day for Constantinople; he will spend some months there to negotiate Commercial Treaty with the Porte. It is generally believed here that the renewal of agitation against him is the real cause of his departure. He informs me that he tendered his resignation to the Shah, but His Majesty would not accept it.

No. 4.

Sir C. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 3.)

(No. 578. Confidential.)

My Lord,

St. Petersburg, September 29, 1905.

THE Persian Minister called on me yesterday evening, and I took the opportunity to speak to him of the Seistan Water Award.

I mentioned to him that I had sent to the Ain-ed-Dowleh, during the Shah's visit to St. Petersburg, a sealed letter from Sir A. Hardinge, the contents of which were at that time unknown to me, but which I now know to have been in connection with the Seistan Award. I said that he was no doubt aware that, during the Shah's stay at Vichy, a telegram had been sent to the Minister for Foreign Affairs at Tehran, instructing him to reject the Water Award, which had been made by the British Commissioner, after local examination and careful consideration of the interests involved.

Such a step would create a very unfavourable impression in London where it is already known that it was due to the intrigues and advice of the Russian Legation in Tehran, who had not scrupled to state that the Persian Commissioner, the Yamin-i-Nizam, had been unduly influenced by bribes. The matter was one in which the Russian Government could have no possible interest, and it was not likely that His Majesty's Government would tolerate their interference. His Majesty's Government had absolutely no reason to be more partial to the Afghans than to the Persians, the policy of His Majesty's Government being, as he knew, to maintain the independence and integrity of Persia, and as the Water Award appeared to have failed to give satisfaction either to the Afghans or to the Persians, the conclusion to be arrived at was its absolute fairness. It was unfortunate, however, that the Persian Government should have listened to the counsels of Mr. Speyer, and should have lent themselves to the creation of a conflict with His Majesty's Government in a matter where every effort had been made to fulfil, with justice and impartiality, the obligations imposed upon them by Treaty. I inquired if he had heard the matter discussed while he was in attendance on the Shah.

Hassan Mirza Khan replied that he had not heard the matter mentioned. He was aware that His Majesty's Government had, in the initial stages of the work of the Commission, refused to admit the interference of the Russian Consul in Seistan, and he considered their attitude justified by Treaty. He repudiated the idea of the Yamin-i-Nizam, who was personally known to him, having been influenced by bribes, and he felt convinced that upon the Shah's arrival in Tehran the question would be satisfactorily settled, since, from the conversations he heard during the time that he accompanied the Shah, he knew that His Majesty had confidence in the disinterestedness and friendly attitude of His Majesty's Government.

I pointed out to him that during the stay of Colonel MacMahon's mission in Persia all sorts of absurd rumours had been spread of the arrival of a British military expedition, and of the intention of the Commission to permanently occupy Seistan, which had proved absolutely false, and the rejection of the Award would probably entail the dispatch of another Commission under an officer of higher rank to examine, and revise, if necessary, the Award already given by Colonel MacMahon. It was for the Persian Government to decide whether such a step, which would probably only end

in the confirmation of the Award, would be more to the advantage of the Persian Government than its present acceptance.

The Persian Minister said that he would write to his Government and mention the considerations which I had laid before him.

I have, &c.

(Signed)

CHARLES HARDINGE.

No. 5.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 4.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 3rd October, relative to the Seistan Water Award.

India Office, October 4, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 5.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

October 3, 1905.

SEISTAN Water Award.

Please refer to the telegram of the 14th September from His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran. A letter, dated the 17th September, has been received from the Ameer, in which he dissents from the appointment of an irrigation officer, on the ground, firstly, that no further disputes are possible since the water rights of both parties have been described by McMahon's Award, and, secondly, that, should any such disputes arise, the special deputation of a British officer to arbitrate upon them could be arranged. Danger to which a resident officer would be subject is also put forward as a pretext.

Pending the result of the negotiations with the Shah, it is not proposed to make any further communication to the Ameer on the subject. The report submitted by Etisham-ul-Vezareh will no doubt influence the Shah; and we trust that all possible pressure will be put upon him with a view to inducing him to accept Award in its entirety.

In a telegraphic report of the 26th September from Macpherson it is stated that probability of serious disputes such as he had been anticipating is reduced by a satisfactory rise which has taken place in the Helmund.

(Repeated to Tehran.)

No. 6.

Sir C. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 4.)

(No. 188.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

St. Petersburg, October 4, 1905.

RIOTS at Meshed.

With reference to Mr. Grant Duff's telegram No. 120 of the 2nd instant, I am informed by the Persian Minister that, owing to the refusal of the Russian Government to pay any compensation for losses sustained by Persian subjects in the riots at Baku, the Persian Government have refused to pay an indemnity for the damage done to the property of Russians in the disturbances at Meshed.

In reply to my warning against the danger of Russian troops entering Meshed should a renewal of the disturbances take place, Mirza Hassan Khan stated that special measures of precaution had been taken to prevent the outbreak of further riots.

No. 7.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 143.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, October 4, 1905.

THE Persian Minister told me to-day that he had received a letter from the Grand Vizier informing him that his Highness accepted all the conditions which His Majesty's Government had attached to the proposed loan. He earnestly trusted, however, that the sum would be made up to 300,000*l.* The Minister told me that formal instructions would be sent to him by the Grand Vizier from Tehran upon the subject.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 8.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 68.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, October 5, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 58 of the 8th July last, the Grand Vizier has informed the Persian Minister that all the conditions attached by His Majesty's Government to the proposed loan have been accepted by his Highness.

A hope is also expressed by the Persian Government, the fulfilment of which will, in all probability, prove impracticable, that the advance may be increased to 300,000*l.*

No. 9.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir C. Hardinge.

(No. 300.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, October 5, 1905.

DURING the course of a long conversation with the Russian Ambassador this afternoon, I recurred to the possibility of an amicable arrangement between Great Britain and Russia of the kind which we had discussed on the 3rd instant (see my despatch No. 290 of that date). I told his Excellency that I was about to leave for Balmoral, where I should see the King and the Prime Minister, and that I was extremely anxious to be exactly aware of his Excellency's views. He repeated to me that he believed the Russian Government and an influential section of the Russian public to be strongly in favour of such an understanding. His own view, however, was that the matter should not be too much pressed at the present moment. Although our Treaty with Japan had not been badly taken, it had undoubtedly come as a shock to public opinion in Russia, and, in his Excellency's opinion, it would be better to give time for the effect to pass off. He would visit St. Petersburg in November, and would take an opportunity of more fully ascertaining Count Lamsdorff's views. It would then be possible for us to resume our conversation.

His Excellency volunteered the statement that, in his view, the Persian question was the only one presenting serious difficulties. He did not, however, see why we should not be able to come to terms with regard to it. Russia did not want to annex Persian territory or to acquire a port on the Persian Gulf, although she might want a *débarcadere* for her trade in those waters. I said that neither had we any desire to encroach upon the integrity of Persia, and that our policy as to foreign commerce was well known. I should be quite ready to discuss the Persian question with his Excellency whenever he was ready to do so.

His Excellency added that he had only one more observation to make, viz., that any arrangement of the kind should not be conceived in a spirit of hostility towards Germany. I said that nothing was further from my thoughts; I failed altogether to see why such an understanding as we both desired should contain any element of hostility either towards Germany or towards any other Power. I thought it most unfortunate that some people's minds should be so constituted as to make them see in every neighbourly arrangement arrived at between two or more Powers a coalition aimed at another.

His Excellency ended by expressing a hope that I would authorize you to take a suitable opportunity, perhaps while his Excellency was in St. Petersburg, to speak to Count Lamsdorff somewhat in the sense of the remarks which I had made.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 10.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 6.)

(No. 125.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 6, 1905.

FOLLOWING sent to Government of India:—

Persian loan. Your telegram No. 68 of the 5th instant.

If fresh loan be granted, would it be possible to insist on payment of a large number of claims which we have against the Persian Government, and which amount to several thousand pounds?

No. 11.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 6.)

(No. 126.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 6, 1905.

I HAVE sent the following telegram to His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez to-day:—

"Mashir-ed-Dowleh has informed United States' Minister that he has given telegraphic instructions to Governor of Urmi to issue public notice that witnesses will be protected by the Persian Government. His Excellency further states that the accused Kurds will be detained in custody, unless and until they have been acquitted after thorough examination of the case, and that Persian Commissioner and you will decide upon, and draw up in writing, procedure at trial.

"American Government will not guarantee protection to witnesses, as being contrary to Treaty, but will insist on this being done by Persian Government.

"Mr. Pearson has thanked us for action we have taken."

No. 12.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 9.)

(No. 128.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 9, 1905.

ACCORDING to a complaint made to me by Persian Government, Vazueh, in the district of Soujboulak, has been entered by Turkish soldiers. They request that His Majesty's Government should instruct Sir N. O'Connor by telegraph to use his good offices in assisting Persian Ambassador at Constantinople to settle matter with Ottoman Government.

No. 13.

Sir C. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 10.)

(No. 596.)

My Lord,

St. Petersburg, October 6, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 578 of the 28th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith, in French translation from the "Journal de

Saint-Petersbourg," an official communiqué replying to a statement from Reuter's agency, published in the "Times" of the 29th ultimo,* respecting the proceedings of Colonel MacMahon's Delimitation Commission in Seistan, denying that obstacles raised to the work of the Commission were due to intrigues on the part of Russia, and that M. Miller had been withdrawn in consequence of his failure to frustrate the objects of the Mission. The communiqué at the same time maintains the accuracy of a statement made in the "Trans-Caspian Review," to the effect that by the Award the Persians receive only a third of the water of the Helmund, whereas previously they had in their possession a more considerable quantity than the Afghans, sufficient to irrigate the whole Province of Seistan, which is much larger than the narrow strip of arable land in Afghan territory irrigated by the waters of the Helmund.

No denial is given in this communication to the statement in the "Times" that anti-British riots were organized and arranged to take place on the King's birthday.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES HARDINGE.

No. 14.

Persian Transport Company to Foreign Office.—(Received October 10.)

3, Salter's Hall Court, Cannon Street, London,
October 9, 1905.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inclose a copy of a report on the condition of the Bakhtiari road which has just reached us from Mr. Parry, our principal manager, whose experience is a long one and in whose judgment we place full confidence. Mr. Parry has, you will recognize, gone fully into the matter and spent much time, which to us is very valuable, on the road. I also inclose a copy of a despatch addressed by him to His Majesty's Minister in Tehran, dated Ahwaz, the 21st August.

My Board would feel obliged if you would kindly communicate the first of these documents to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran for his confidential information.

Referring to paragraph No. 1 of Mr. Parry's letter of the 21st August, 1905, to Sir Arthur Hardinge, we would point out that on the 22nd March we last addressed you on this subject, and dealt with the proposals made by the Chiefs to allow us 3,000 tomans for the immediate repairs to the road, and an annual sum of 1,000 tomans for upkeep. We pointed out that these sums would be wholly insufficient; but, as the season of the year was favourable for the execution of the repairs, we succeeded in persuading the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company to lend us the services of one of their engineers in order that the road should not further suffer. We therefore accepted the proposal, upon certain conditions which were to be formally approved by the Chiefs. Not having heard further from you on the subject, and not having received any communication from the Chiefs, we were, of course, unable to proceed with the work. Since that time the road has deteriorated in a very marked degree, and the sums then proposed can effect very little. Moreover, the autumn is so far advanced that we fear that there will not be time for us to hear from you before the winter sets in.

We do not know whether we can now obtain from the Euphrates and Tigris Company the services of an engineer for the purpose at the very short notice which alone could be given them. In any case, the work would have to be resumed in the spring.

While we are still anxious to endeavour to meet the views of His Majesty's Government by spending any reasonable sum allotted by the Chiefs for the immediate repair of the road to the best of our ability, you will, my Board feels sure, recognize that ours is a commercial Company, and can therefore not continue to make offers out of which they receive no pecuniary benefit whatever, besides having all their current arrangements dislocated. We therefore trust that His Majesty's Government will

* Not printed.

use their good offices with the Chiefs with a view to some arrangement of a permanent nature under which we may be enabled to keep the road in repair on ordinary commercial principles of pecuniary advantage to ourselves as well as to the Chiefs. It must be remembered that not only does this work involve the services of engineers, but also an immense amount of correspondence and trouble is entailed upon our staff.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FRANK BOTTOMLEY, *Secretary.*

Inclosure 1 in No. 14.

Mr. Parry to Messrs. Lynch Brothers.

Dear Sirs,

Ahwaz, August 21, 1905.

I LEFT Ispahan on the 30th ultimo, and arrived here on the evening of the 17th instant, after an extremely hot and uncomfortable journey.

Condition of the Bakhtiari Road.—In order to examine the summer route from Ispahan to Dopolun, I travelled via Naghun, and from Dopolun returned along the winter route towards Ardal, to examine a portion of that section known as Girmiseh, where several bad places had been reported to me by muleteers travelling on the road.

After leaving Ardal the road enters a gorge and crosses a pass called Girmiseh. In this section there are several places which are in a very bad condition owing to the track having been washed away by flood-water running down the hill.

In two places these wash-outs have been repaired by the Chiefs in a very perfunctory manner, by placing a branch of a tree on the outer edge of the track and lodging smaller branches and twigs between it and the rocks on the inner edge, covering the whole with a thin layer of earth.

In one place the track has been broken away for about 30 feet, leaving a bare and almost perpendicular rock on the inner side, and a sharp drop down the side of the hill on the outer.

This has been repaired by the Chiefs in the manner mentioned above, the branch on the outer edge being supported by uprights stuck into loose debris brought down by the flood-water.

It is obvious that places of this sort in the track are nothing more than traps to send a loaded animal crossing them to destruction. In dry weather an animal may get over without accident, but after rain the risk of crossing must be great.

The greater part of this section needs urgent repair before the winter comes on.

From Dopolun I followed a caravan of about 120 mules loaded with heavy loads of carpets and almonds en route for Ahwaz, in order to personally see how the animals negotiated the bad place on the road, I am therefore able to report, not in the light of a traveller travelling with lightly loaded animals, but with the full knowledge of the difficulties to be overcome.

I desire to emphasize this point, as it is a very different matter to control a long string of heavily laden mules than controlling a small caravan with light loads, accompanied by two or three mounted servants. Travelling under the first condition, the difficulties arising out of the condition of the track are clearly demonstrated by forcible illustrations, while in the second they are less likely to be noticed by the mere fact that the light weight of the loads, coupled with the controlling influence of mounted men, enable the animals to pass with comparative ease places which are dangerous to animals heavily laden.

Leaving Dopolun the track passes Osten-i-Polengi, a place which was very bad when I passed over the road in 1903. It has recently been repaired by the Chiefs, and is in fair condition.

Passing the plateau of Baramordeh the road descends by zigzags down to Gundum Kar. Here I passed forty men at work repairing the zigzags. They had completed half the way down, and the difference between the part repaired and the part remaining to be done was remarkable. In the latter portion the track is very rough

and covered with loose stones, making the passage of mules, or more especially camels, very difficult.

Passing Sarkhun the road enters Shellil gorge, the northern approach to the Pul-i-Amarat bridge. This gorge is formed by a small stream running through a ravine bounded on each side by steep slopes composed of friable earth and rocks.

In several parts the track has been entirely washed away and a path formed above. The greater portion of it slopes at a dangerous angle, and during wet weather I was told that camels cannot get across it at all, and are compelled to wait until it becomes dry before making the attempt. The whole of this section should have attention annually. It is very difficult to make any sort of road here which is likely to be permanent, except at a very heavy expenditure, owing to the nature of the drainage and the large quantity of rain which falls during the wet season.

Leaving Pul-i-Amarat bridge, the track rises in zigzags over Maulwari Hill. This portion all requires repair, but the road is no worse than when I saw it in 1903. I understand the Chiefs have made some repairs here, but I was unable to discover any indications of new work.

From Dehdiz the road descends zigzags known as Kulmut, the surface of which is extremely bad. At the summit of the zigzags the Chiefs have resorted to their usual method of repairing a dangerous place by placing branches of trees covered with a thin layer of earth over a landslide. This should be properly repaired and the surface of the descent to near Godar-i-Balutak should also have attention. Excepting the broken-away point at the summit, this section cannot be called dangerous, but for heavily laden animals it is decidedly a difficult one.

Between Godar-i-Balutak and Kuleh Madressa, near the Sultanieh road, the track is bad and broken away to a dangerously narrow path in many parts.

Close to Kuleh Madressa a loaded mule belonging to the caravan travelling with me lost his footing and fell over the precipice, broke his thigh-bone, and was abandoned to his fate. A broader and less stony track would have enabled the animal to recover foothold. This unfortunate accident illustrates the danger to loaded animals travelling the road in its present condition, and this danger would be greatly increased in wet weather, when the surface becomes slippery.

Descending to Malamir plain, the track down Malamir Hill is very bad on its surface, and is decidedly worse than when I last saw it.

The crossing at the stream at Sheshmeh Roghan is still very bad and has not been repaired since 1903.

The descent down Jaru Hill is also in the same condition as in 1903. It is in a deplorable condition.

The following are the places most in need of repair:—

1. Girmiseh Gorge, between Ardal and Dopolun.
2. Shellil Gorge, between Sarkhun and Pul-i-Amarat.
3. Maulwari Hill, between Pul-i-Amarat and Dehdiz.
4. Kulmut, between Dehdiz and Godar-i-Balutak.
5. Section between Kuleh Madressa and Godar.
6. Malamir Hill.
7. Cheshmeh Roghan crossing.
8. Jaru Hill.

Sections Nos. 1, 2, and 4 are dangerous, while the others are difficult, and are certainly an obstacle to caravan traffic.

All of these places were in a good condition when the road was first handed over to the Chiefs, and have come to their present condition owing to neglect.

I have examined the road surface, carefully avoiding looking at it in the light of a "Rotten Row," or a road to be galloped over as is alleged we desire to maintain, by a Government official in a recent report, and I can safely say without exaggeration that as a track for laden animals to travel over, it cannot be considered otherwise than dangerous in parts and extremely difficult for some considerable distance, while it remains in its present dilapidated state.

Bridges.—The broken bridge crossing the Zendeh Rud at Bistagan was being repaired when I passed that place. In 1903 beams formed a temporary passage over the broken arches which are now being reconstructed.

The brick bridge built by the Chiefs at Dopolun is in good order, and both Pul-i-Amarat and Godar-i-Balutak bridges are in an excellent state of repair, both as regards the iron work and the masonry.

Caravanserais.—Below are particulars of the stages, and the accommodation for animals and loads:—

Stages.	Accommodation.
1. Pul Vargan	Caravanserai.
2. Bistagan	Poor accommodation in private houses.
3. Kavarukh	Ditto.
4. Karaghi	Ditto.
4 A. Winter route, Ardal	Ditto.
5. Nughun	Ditto.
6. Dopolun	Dopolun caravanserai.
7. Sarkhun	Ditto.
8. Shellil	Ditto.
9. Dehdiz	Ditto.
10. Godar-i-Balutak	Ditto.
11. Malamir	Ditto.
12. Kuleh Tal	Accommodation for animals in private houses only.
13. Tawla.	
14. Jaru.	
15. Alwanieh.	
16. Wais	Poor accommodation for animals and loads in the Sheikhs' Khans.
17. Ahwaz.	

Dopolun, Sarkhun, and Dehdiz caravanserais are in a ruinous condition, and afford no protection to loads. Work of rebuilding Dopolun serai was going on as I passed, but judging from last year's work, which collapsed during the winter, I fear the work is not much good.

Shellil, Godar-i-Balutak, and Malamir serais are in good condition, and it is said that the Chiefs contemplate repairing Sarkhun and Dehdiz buildings this year.

In the stations where there are no caravanserais loads are stacked in the open and muleteers and their animals find shelter in stables or houses belonging to private individuals.

To complete the equipment of the road, caravanserais should be erected at Karaghi, Kavarukh, Ardal, Gandumkar, Kuleh Tal, Jaru, and Alwanieh.

The Chiefs have no reasonable excuse for not building these caravanserais, as they farm out the right to sell fodder at each of the stations for a fixed annual payment, varying according to the importance of the place. In this way the traffic pay for accommodation in the enhanced price of fodder, which, however, is not afforded them.

Earnings from Tolls.—In 1904 the Chief farmed the right to collect tolls on the bridges for 120,000 krans, and this year they demanded 150,000 krans, but were unable to obtain an offer to this amount, and now collect the tolls by their own servants.

They have increased the rate at which they have let the right every year. I understand it was 9,000 krans in 1902; 110,000 krans in 1903; 120,000 krans in 1904; and a demand for 150,000 krans in this year.

I am, &c.
(Signed) FRED. W. PARRY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 14.

Mr. Parry to Sir A. Hardinge.

Sir,

Ahwaz, August 21, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that on my way from Ispahan to Ahwaz I visited the Bakhtiari Chiefs at Chargharkor, and in the course of an interview with his Excellency the Sirdar Asad the following subjects were referred to in the sense given below:—

1. *Arrangements for the Repairs to the Road made between the Chiefs and Mr. Preece.*

His Excellency expressed surprise and annoyance because the Chiefs had received no reply as to whether Messrs. Lynch Brothers accepted the arrangement or not, and I gathered from the tone of his remarks that he thought that my principals were purposely withholding their reply.

I informed his Excellency that a reply had been sent to the Legation some months ago, but as I was not at liberty to disclose official communications to His Majesty's Minister, I could only say that I believed Messrs. Lynch Brothers had accepted the proposal under certain conditions which would not be difficult to arrange.

His Excellency requested me to write to the Legation expressing their wish to have the matter settled without delay.

In passing on his Excellency's remarks I desire to point out the importance of arriving at a prompt settlement in order that the work of repair to the road can be commenced before the coming autumn.

The track further deteriorates every winter, and if we are compelled to defer the work of repair until next spring the small sum of 30,000 krans to be allotted to us for the purpose will not go very far.

2. Erection of Caravanserais to accommodate the Traffic.

I have already had the honour of drawing your attention to the necessity of getting more caravanserais erected on the road for the accommodation of the traffic and the protection of goods during wet weather, and I recently took the liberty of suggesting that the opportunity of settling with the Chiefs with regard to the repairs to the track might be a good one to arrange with them to carry out their promise to erect the necessary buildings.

Should it be deemed expedient to couple these two matters when advising the Chiefs of Messrs. Lynch's conditional acceptance of the repair arrangement, I submit the following notes regarding the caravanserais needed, for the information of the Legation:—

STAGES on the Road Isfahan to Ahwaz, with particulars of Accommodation at each Station.

Stages.	Accommodation.
1. Isfahan.	
2. Pal Vazan	Caravanserai.
3. Bistagan	Poor accommodation in private houses.
4. Kavarukh	Ditto.
5. Karaghi	Ditto.
6. Ardal	Ditto.
7. Dopolun	Caravanserai, in ruins, now being repaired.
8. Sarkhun	Caravanserai in very bad condition.
9. Shelli	Caravanserai in good condition.
10. Dehiz	Caravanserai in bad condition.
11. Godar-i-Bahak	Caravanserai in good condition.
12. Mahmir	Ditto.
13. Kuleh Tal	Poor accommodation in houses.
14. Towla	No accommodation.
15. Jaru	Ditto.
16. Alwanich	Ditto.
17. Wais	Fair accommodation in houses.
18. Ahwaz.	

At the stations where there are no caravanserais loads are stacked in the open, and muleteers and their animals find shelter in houses belonging to private individuals.

To completely equip the road for the traffic which already is frequenting it, caravanserais are much needed at the following places:—

1. Karaghi.
2. Kavarukh.
3. Ardal.
4. Gundunkar. Between Dopolun and Sarkhun.
5. Kuleh Tal.
- 5A. Towla.
6. Jaru.
7. Alwanich.

The Chiefs have no reasonable excuse on the score of expense for not building them, as they now farm out the right to sell fodder and supplies at all the stations for an annual payment, the consequence being that Charvadars pay indirectly in the enhanced price of fodder and supplies for accommodation which is not afforded them.

3. Robberies on the Road.

Two serious robberies have recently taken place on the road near Maulwari Hill.

A caravan of loads from Ahwaz was raided about a month ago. Seventeen mules were stolen, and half a load of piece goods is missing. About twenty days later another caravan was robbed, and several animals stolen.

The Chiefs informed me that they were taking strong steps to put a stop to these robberies, but as the thieves are Kugaloos, who inhabit the neighbourhood of Behbahan, they experienced considerable difficulty in punishing them. They further said they got no assistance from the Governor of Fars, who rules the province in which the Kugaloos are located, and requested me to solicit your assistance in representing this difficulty to the proper authorities.

I have, &c.

(Signed) FRED. W. PARRY (representing Messrs. Lynch Brothers), Agents of the Persian Transport Company (Limited).

No. 15.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 144.)

Foreign Office, October 10, 1905.

Sir,

I HAVE received Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 179 of the 17th August last, inclosing copy of a note addressed by him to the Grand Vizier urging the acceptance in its entirety by the Persian Government of the Scistan Water Award.

The terms of this note are approved by His Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 16.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 11.)

(No. 129.)

Tehran, October 11, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

RESERVE arms for Meshed Consulate-General.

In a further note which I to-day received from the Persian Government, they state that every effort is being made to preserve order, and special measures being taken to afford protection to the Consular officers of friendly Powers. If arms were imported for Consulate-General, public excitement would be aroused and the safety of the Consulate-General endangered. If desired, troops will be provided temporarily to protect the building.

Strong pressure will, in my opinion, have to be exercised if sanction is to be obtained.

(Repeated to India and Meshed.)

No. 17.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir C. Hardinge.

(No. 304. Confidential.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, October 11, 1905.

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 578, Confidential, of the 29th ultimo, recording a conversation with the Persian Minister on the subject of the Seistan Arbitration Award.

I approve the language held by your Excellency on this occasion.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 18.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 145.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, October 11, 1905.

I HAVE considered, in communication with His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 163, Confidential, of the 26th July and your telegram No. 105 of the 31st August last, in regard to the desire of the Persian Government for the withdrawal of the British Consular guards from Persia.

His Majesty's Government see no reason to modify the views already expressed to you on this subject in my despatch No. 165 of the 16th November, 1901.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 19.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 12.)

(No. 130.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 12, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Majid-es-Sultanch. Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 130 of the 11th June.

Wratislaw leaves for Urmī to-morrow, and the Majid-es-Sultanch is still in asylum at Consulate-General at Tabreez. The Shah refuses to sanction his desired journey to Europe, and he rightly distrusts the assurances offered by the Persian Government that if he leaves the Consulate-General he will not be molested. My efforts to induce the Grand Vizier to listen to reason have been vain. Our good name is at stake, for this man is the only Persian who has behaved well in the Urmī affair, and it is out of the question to throw him over now.

Might Consul-General at Tabreez be instructed to appoint him Munshi to the Consulate-General, provide him with a British passport, and send him across the Turkish or Russian frontier? I can see no other alternative, and, if this course is not approved, should be glad to receive instructions.

The Persian Government are badly in need of a lesson.

No. 20.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 12.)

(No. 131.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 12, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Urmī case. Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 130 of the 11th June.

In spite of the assurances given to the Minister, the Persian Government now refuse to carry out their promise that the Mollah now at Tabreez should be sent to Meshed or Tehran.

I was informed to-day by the Grand Vizier that he is sending instructions by post to the Persian Minister in London to explain to your Lordship the reasons for their refusal, but this is merely a pretext for delay.

Importance is attached by Mr. Wratislaw to the Mollah's removal, and I concur, and am strongly of opinion that, before the pending inquiry at Urmī opens, he should be sent either here or to Meshed.

In spite of my urgent request to the American Minister that he should leave instructions with his Vice-Consul before leaving Tehran, he has gone off to Russia to meet his wife without giving his Vice-Consul any instructions whatever.

No. 21.

Memorandum on the Proposed Improvements in Communications between Russian Territory and Northern Persia.[Reference is invited to the map attached.]¹⁰

ACCORDING to Sir C. Hardinge's despatch No. 562 of the 23rd September last, the following announcement appeared in the "Slovo" of the 9th (22nd) idem:—

"The Persian Government, as we have heard, is at the present time in consultation with the Russian Government on the subject of improving the ways of communication connecting the Northern Persian Provinces with our Central Asian possessions. A party of engineers and mechanics will be dispatched in November for the purpose of making investigations along the Persian frontier."

2. The following routes have from time to time occupied Russian attention:—

- (a.) From Transcaucasia into North-west Persia:—
Erivan-Julfa-Tabreez-Tehran. Baku-Lenkoran-Resht.
- (b.) From the Caspian into North-west Persia:—
Enzeli-Resht-Kazvin-Tehran. Kazvin-Hamadan.
- (c.) From Russian Turkestan into North-east Persia:—
Askabad-Kuchan-Meshed. Dushak-Meshed.
- (d.) From Meshed to Tehran.

3. Recent information from Consular and other reports about these routes is as follows:—

Erivan-Julfa-Tabreez-Tehran.

The Russian railway from Alexandropol, on the Tiflis-Kars line, has now been completed to Erivan, and is being prolonged towards the Persian frontier, which it was expected to reach last June. Its completion has, however, not yet been announced.

The Concession for the construction of a carriage-road from Julfa to Tabreez, and thence to Kazvin, has been held by the Russian Banque d'Escompte since 1902. In October 1903 Mr. Spring-Rice reported that it was to be constructed in such a way as to be easily converted into a railway, and that rails and other material were being stored at Erivan for that purpose. Work on the road from the Julfa end was commenced last year, and a British officer who travelled over it in February last reported that about one-third of the distance between Julfa and Tabreez was then already macadamized. It is not known whether the eventual construction of a railway has been kept in view. At present the work is suspended, owing to a quarrel between the engineer and the contractor. The country near Julfa appears to be difficult, and part of the road has recently been carried away by a flood.

The road is used by "post-fourgons," except between Tabreez and Zinjan, where the journey is performed by pack-horses. Sir A. Hardinge reported in June last that the Russian Ministry of Finance had decided to organize a service of motor-cars for the transport of goods between Julfa and Tehran. Some difficulties, however, appear to have arisen in this connection, owing to certain objections on the part of a Persian concessionaire, and no further developments have as yet been reported.

* Not printed.

Baku-Lenkoran-Resht.

4. The construction of a railway along this alignment has been mooted, but, so far as is known, no preparatory work has yet been undertaken, and from a report in 1903, it would appear that the project has been abandoned in favour of the Julfa, Tehran route. At present, goods are shipped from Baku to Enzeli, but the landing at the latter port is difficult in bad weather. An extension of the railway from Baku would therefore greatly facilitate communication with Northern Persia.

Enzeli-Resht-Kazvin-Tehran.

5. A carriage-road from Resht to Kazvin was completed in 1899 by a Russian Company, and is now in regular use. At Kazvin it joins the Kazvin-Tehran carriage-road.

The unsuitability of Enzeli as a port has hitherto detracted considerably from the value of this road as a trade route, and the Russians have therefore lately turned their attention to the improvement of the harbour, and have already expended some 50,000*l.* on dredging and other operations. Last June Mr. Churchill, Acting Consul at Resht, observed great activity on the part of the Russian engineers there, and reported the arrival of a new steam dredger.

A new Russian cart-road has lately been completed from Kazian, a village on the eastern side of the entrance to Enzeli Harbour, to Resht, its object being to enable goods to be transferred direct from ships to carts or camels, instead of their being conveyed across Mardab Lagoon in lighters from Enzeli to Pir-i-Bazar, as was formerly the case. Kazian has become a regular Russian settlement, with brick buildings and wooden sheds, and the foundations have already been laid for new moles to form a harbour, which will facilitate trade with Persia via the Caspian.

The scheme for the establishment of a motor service has also been extended by the Russian Minister of Finance to the Resht-Kazvin-Tehran road, and in June last Sir A. Hardinge reported that three 40-h.p. Mercedes cars had arrived at Enzeli, and forty others had been ordered. He was of opinion that, owing to the bad state of parts of the road, the scheme would prove a costly one, but that, if it succeeds, it will reduce the transit of goods between Resht and Tehran from ten days to three.

Kazvin-Hamadan.

6. From Kazvin a Russian Company has a Concession for a carriage-road to Hamadan, where it will join the important trade route leading to Bagdad via Khanakin. Russian engineers were at work on it throughout 1904, and completed most of the levelling and embankments. As regards gradients and bridges, it is reported to be constructed so as to be converted into a railway, and it is also intended to establish a Russian motor service on it as soon as the roadway is sufficiently far advanced.

Askabad-Kuchan-Meshed.

7. This road, worked partly by a Russian and partly by a Persian Company, has existed as a carriage-road since 1891, and is regularly used by "fourgons" between Askabad and Meshed. On the Russian side of the frontier it is kept in good repair, but on the Persian side the culverts and embankments have been allowed to become dilapidated.

This route has been frequently mentioned as being one of the first which Russia would seek to convert into a railway, with a view to connecting the Central Asian railway system with Khorasan, and with the idea of a possible extension to Tehran and Seistan. It would, however be hardly possible to convert the present road into a railway, owing to the zig-zags by which it ascends the mountain to Kuchan from the Russian side, although from Kuchan to Meshed the conversion would be a comparatively easy matter.

Dushak-Meshed.

8. The Concession for this road is at present held by a Persian Company. Surveys were made in 1904 for an improved cart-road, but no work seems to have been done. It was recently reported in the Russian press that Messrs. Nobel Brothers, a firm of oil merchants, have spent some 1,100*l.* on improving an alternative road via Chaachia to Meshed, with a view to using motor-cars for the conveyance of their goods.

Meshed-Tehran.

9. In July last it was reported (on native authority) that the Russian Consul-General and the head of the Russian Bank at Meshed had been discussing the project of a railway from Meshed to Tehran, and that the Mashir-ed-Dowleh had promised a reply to the Russian Minister on the Shah's return from Europe. A supposed Russian had also arrived in Meshed, and was proceeding to Tehran in order to examine the road.

There would be no serious physical obstacles to the construction of a railway from Meshed to Tehran via Shahrud and Samnan, where a road practicable for wheeled traffic already exists. The advantage to Russia of such a railway would obviously be of the highest importance, since it would, assuming Meshed to be connected with the Central Asian Railway, consolidate the predominating position which, politically, strategically, and commercially, she already occupies in Northern Persia.

*General Staff, War Office,
London, October 12, 1905.*

No. 22.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 13.)

(No. 132.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 13, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Seistan Water Award.

According to the Grand Vizier, maps and documents were sent to the Persian Minister in London some time ago, and he will explain to your Lordship the reasons on which the inhabitants of Seistan base their complaint that the Award is not a fair one.

No. 23.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 14th October, relative to the supply of arms for the protection of the Meshed and Seistan Consulates.

India Office, October 16, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 23.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

October 14, 1905.

PLEASE see telegram of the 11th instant from Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran.

We strongly urge that action indicated in our telegram of the 10th September should be taken. We regard as frivolous the pretexts put forward by the Persian Government for refusing their consent to the import of arms for protection of Consulates at Meshed and Seistan.

No. 24.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

(No. 662.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, October 17, 1905.

THE French Ambassador told me to-day that, during his visit to Paris, M. Nélidoff had spoken to him with much frankness as to the possibility of an understanding between Great Britain and Russia. Such an understanding was earnestly desired by M. Nélidoff himself and by Count Lamsdorff. They feared, however, that the matter could not be much advanced at the present time. The resentment created in Russia by the recently concluded Anglo-Japanese Agreement was deeper than would be supposed from the language used by the Russian press. We had, M. Cambon observed, fortunately taken the precaution of explaining our policy to the Russian Government in the most considerate terms, and we had thereby disarmed a good deal of hostile criticism. The feeling of hostility, nevertheless, existed, and must be taken into account. For this reason both M. Nélidoff and Count Lamsdorff were not in favour of an early discussion. On the other hand, Germany was taking advantage of the opportunity in order, if possible, to estrange France and England. M. de Witte, upon whom his interview with the German Emperor had produced a great effect, was working strenuously for this purpose, and it was suggested that, as Great Britain and Japan had formed a coalition which would give them a preponderating influence in Eastern Asia, the time had come for the other Powers interested in that part of the world to form another coalition by which the balance of power might be maintained. In these circumstances his Excellency could not help thinking that we should do well to be prepared for an exchange of views with the Russian Government at the earliest possible moment. As to this, M. Nélidoff had suggested, and his Excellency thought the suggestion a valuable one, that His Majesty's Government should consider in good time the requirements which would be put forward on behalf of Great Britain whenever the moment arrived for opening negotiations. It was, his Excellency said, Great Britain which had constantly complained of Russian encroachments, and we ought to be in a position to define clearly the grounds of our complaint, and the terms which we could afford to accept.

His Excellency referred briefly to the relations of this country with Russia in regard to Afghanistan, Persia, and the Near East. I said that in regard to Afghanistan we had already defined our position with considerable distinctness. We had laid it down—and I did not believe that Russia would dispute our contention—that the external relations of Afghanistan must remain under the direction of this country. We had, on the other hand, indicated our readiness to enter into arrangements which would provide for the prompt settlement, by direct negotiation between the Russian and Afghan frontier officials, of purely local disputes having no serious political importance. As to Persia, it seemed to me that the main object should be to put an end to the unfortunate rivalry of the two Powers, whom the Persian Government invariably endeavoured to play off against one another, and we, of course, desired that an equal opportunity should be afforded to our commerce in Persian territory. As for the Near East, I thought it was for Russia, rather than for us, to indicate what she wanted.

I told his Excellency that I had already had an informal discussion with Count Benckendorff, who had given me an account of his views not dissimilar from that just given to me by his Excellency.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 25.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 71. Confidential.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, October 18, 1905.

WITH reference to your telegrams Nos. 130 and 131 of the 12th instant on the subject of Urumia affairs, His Majesty's Government must insist on the Persian Government carrying out their promise to remove the Mullah, and if any further delay should seem desirable, the circumstances pointing to such delay should be at once communicated to His Majesty's Government through the Legation at Tehran.

You should continue to press the Grand Vizier to sanction the departure for Europe of the Majid-es-Sultaneh, and except as a last resource we are reluctant to adopt your proposal.

In informing the Grand Vizier of His Majesty's Government's decision as regards the Mullah, you might hint that, if we could obtain at once a satisfactory solution of the Majid question, His Majesty's Government might consent to a short delay in the removal of the Mullah.

No. 26.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 145.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, October 18, 1905.

THE Persian Minister left with me to-day the inclosed translation of a telegram which he had received from the Persian Minister of Foreign Affairs. I told the Minister that I was not familiar with the facts referred to, but that I would make inquiries with regard to them at once.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Inclosure in No. 26.

*Telegraphic Message received by the Persian Minister from the Mushir-e-i-Dowleh,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.*

(Translation.)

LAHIJAN, a district of Suj Bulok Mokri and Vazneh, a "mahal" (sub-division) of that district, have been for years in the possession of Persian owners, and have been the abode of the "Piran" tribe. Every year the Government of Suj Bulak, for the purpose of collecting revenue and of maintaining security, used to send there a military force. In view of the adjacency of this district to Turkish frontier each time that a military force was dispatched thither, the Turkish Embassy, acting upon directions received from the Porte, asked the Ministry for Foreign Affairs for the reason. We used to reply that it was for the purpose of preserving internal order, and that after having carried out their object they would return. The Turkish Embassy in their notes (referred to the maintenance) of the *status quo* there, and wished that it should be safe from occupation. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs' reply used to be that, even considering that in the survey of the agents of the four Governments the maintenance of the *status quo* in that district was declared, at that very period both Lahijan and Vazneh were in the possession of Persia. Last year they sent there a force composed of seventy men, but after steps had been taken they were withdrawn.

Recently they secretly sent troops, artillery, and a military force to Lahijan and Vazneh, and have occupied it. This has been written to the Turkish Embassy, and protest has been made to the British and Russian Legations, whose Governments were arbitrators in the frontier delimitation, and they have been requested to ask their Governments to instruct their Ambassadors in Constantinople to assist the Arfa-ed-Dowleh (Persian Ambassador in Constantinople) in this matter. You will bring this matter before the Marquess of Lansdowne, and ask his Lordship for urgent instructions to be sent to the British Ambassador to act strongly in this matter, and to support the Arfa-ed-Dowleh.

No. 27.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 73.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, October 20, 1905.

YOU should continue to press strongly for permission to import arms to Meshed, as a measure necessary for self-protection, and, if the Persian Government will consent to allow it, you may tell them that care will be taken to keep the arms concealed from public view, both on and after their arrival.

The above is in reply to your telegram No. 129 of the 11th instant.

No. 28.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 147.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, October 20, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 50 of the 28th March, I transmit herewith copy of a further letter from the Persian Transport Company relative to the proposed contribution from the Bakhtiari Chiefs for repairs to the Ahwaz-Ispahan road.*

I request that you will furnish me with a report on the present state of this question.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 29.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 21.)

(No. 134.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, October 21, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Urmi affairs.

The substance of your Lordship's telegram No. 7 of the 18th instant has been communicated by me to the Grand Vizier, and I have also hinted to him the arrangement suggested therein, as instructed.

I have received messages from him both yesterday and to-day, in which he represents that the situation has changed in the following respects since the Persian Government made its promise:—

1. That fanaticism in Azerbaijan has been greatly increased by the recent disturbances in the Caucasus, and that consequently there is much greater danger of the Christian population being attacked.
2. That the Mollah, who is of great age, is very ill.
3. That, in view of the excitement already prevailing at Tabreez, his removal might place the Persian Government in a very difficult position.
4. That, with the trial impending at Urmi, where the Mollah enjoys great respect, the situation at that place might become dangerous.

With regard to the Majid-es-Sultanh, his Highness said that he would resist at all costs any attempt to remove him. If he were allowed to go to Europe the Russians would at once make this an excuse for continually interfering to protect Persian subjects in Azerbaijan.

I have proposed, as a possible solution, that I will do what I properly can to induce His Majesty's Government to drop the question of the removal of the Mollah from Tabreez, provided he be kept there, and proper precautions taken to insure that he does nothing to defeat the ends of justice in the inquiry at Urmi. In return for this, I should expect a written assurance from his Highness that neither the Majid nor his property would be molested.

The Grand Vizier, who most earnestly hopes that my proposal will find favour with your Lordship, seems much more friendly than he was before his European journey.

Of course I have informed him that I cannot in any way guarantee that my solution of the difficulty will prove acceptable to His Majesty's Government, but it might be politic to stretch a point to meet his views.

* No. 14.

No. 30.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 23.)

(No. 721.)

My Lord,

Therapia, October 17, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegrams Nos. 181 and 182 of the 9th instant, relative to the complaint of the Persian Government that the Vazneh district of Soujboulak had been entered by Turkish troops, I have the honour to report that the Persian Embassy here has recently been making active representations on this subject to the Porte, but I have failed to obtain from either side a satisfactory account of the points in dispute.

Your Lordship is aware that a very considerable portion of the Turco-Persian frontier has never been definitely fixed. The Commission appointed for that purpose in 1857, whose work continued till 1865, failed in many instances to agree, and separated after its members had sent in individual reports to their respective Governments.

The border-lands, being open country, with a few settled habitations and a nomad population on either side, pass frequently from the occupation of Turkish to Persian and Persian to Turkish tribes, according to local circumstances, though the Ottoman authorities have lately endeavoured to establish the principle that immigrants shall not be allowed to occupy lands near the border, but shall be removed some distance into the interior after definitely adopting Ottoman nationality.

In the case of the Wazna (Vazneh)-Lahidjan section of the border, to which Mr. Grant Duff's telegram refers, I gather that the settled population in the disputed territory prefers Turkish to Persian rule, as affording it a slightly greater measure of security from nomad depredations. Persian tribes, however, continually overrun it, and regard it as theirs, while the Persian authorities endeavour to explain away the testimony of the residents by asserting that the Ottoman Government had suborned the Imams and Headmen of the villages in the district.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs informs me that, although no actual delimitation has been effected, there is no real doubt as to the position of the frontier, and his Government has frequently proposed the dispatch of a Joint Commission for the purpose of making it out, but the Persian Government prefer to maintain the present state of affairs. The Persians rejoin that the Turkish Government insists on the acceptance of the separate report of the Ottoman Commissioner, Dervish Pasha, which they have never ceased to contest as inaccurate and inadmissible.

Meanwhile, on the report of the local authorities that Persian troops were collecting in the neighbourhood, the Turks appear to have sent four battalions of infantry and two guns to the frontier, where they have occupied a series of positions and have constructed guard-houses or made use of old forts.

According to an Agreement between Great Britain and Russia in March 1865 respecting the preparation of a map of the Turco-Persian boundary, the Porte was informed that in the event of any differences arising between the Governments of Persia and Turkey in regard to any particular locality, when marking out the boundary-line, which was to be within the limits traced on the map, the points in dispute should be referred to the decision of the Governments of England and Russia.

Unless, however, the Persian Ambassador approaches me with a definite request for my good offices in the matter, and is able to make out a fair case in support of his Government's claim to the territory in dispute, I do not think that any useful purpose would be gained by my interference in the question at its present stage.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 31.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 74.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, October 25, 1905.

URUMIA. You should endeavour to obtain the desired permission for the Majid to leave Persia, but, if the Persian Government maintain their refusal, you may accept the arrangement proposed in your telegram No. 134 of the 21st instant.

The Grand Vizier's reasons for not allowing the Majid to go appear to us frivolous, as no ground for Russian interference could arise from the Shah's exercise of his right to permit his subjects to leave the country.

No. 32.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, October 25, 1905.*
WITH reference to my letter of the 3rd June last, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Tehran, reporting the capture by the Firman Firma of certain Lurs supposed to have been concerned in the attack on Colonel Douglas and Major Lorimer, and asking for instructions as to the punishment to be inflicted on the prisoners, and on the question of the compensation to be paid by the Persian Government for the outrage.*

As Colonel Douglas and Major Lorimer are both in England, the opportunity was taken of obtaining their observations on this despatch. Copies of Minutes by these two officers are inclosed herewith.† It will be observed that, while they both urge that exemplary punishment should be inflicted on the culprits, they have only been able to identify one of the captives as having actually taken part in the attack upon them.

Lord Lansdowne has carefully considered the matter, in communication with Sir A. Hardinge, who, as Mr. Brodriek is aware, is also in England. Sir A. Hardinge considers that it would be a mistake to execute the one culprit who has been identified, as such a measure would tend to deter the others from surrendering. He suggests that the Firman Firma should be urged to endeavour to secure more of the guilty persons by negotiation, making use of the captive as a hostage, or, if that fails, by a resumption of operations which his Highness promised to undertake as soon as the harvest was over.

Sir A. Hardinge is of opinion that the question of compensation can lie in abeyance for the present. The completion of a further loan to the Persian Government, if it took place, might render it easier to extract payment from them. The amount due can always, in the last resort, be deducted from telegraph royalties.

Lord Lansdowne is disposed to concur in the views expressed by Sir A. Hardinge, and his Lordship proposes, if Mr. Brodriek agrees, to instruct Mr. Grant Duff in the sense suggested.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 33.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, October 25, 1905.*
I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Tehran,‡ transmitting copy of a note which he has addressed to the Persian Government with regard to the status of Bahrein in Persia.

Lord Lansdowne proposes, if Mr. Brodriek concurs, to instruct Mr. Grant Duff by telegraph to endeavour to induce the Persian Government to permit the British Resident at Bushire to exercise his good offices on behalf of Bahrein in Persia, adding, however, that he should avoid any reference to Persian claims to the island, which cannot be recognized by His Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

* See Part III, No. 75*.

† See Part III, Annexes 2 and 3 to Inclosure 2 in No. 75*
‡ See Part III, No. 103.

No. 34.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 26.)

(No. 136.)
(Telegraphic.) P.
FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Tehran, October 26, 1905.

Urmi case.

The American Legation recently asked the Persian Foreign Office that the accused Kurds should be taken from Tabreez to Urmi under arrest.

I have now received the following telegram from Consul-General Wratislaw, who has already arrived at Urmi:—

"The Kurds arrived from Tabreez in complete liberty. Baghir Khan remained for two days near Dilman, and they separated from him there. They were escorted yesterday in triumph to their villages by numbers of their tribe, who, committing a murder on the way, rode out to meet them. They did not go into the town of Urmi."

"Any further appeal by me to the American Minister would seem to be useless, but please inform him that the Kurds may possibly come in for the inquiry, and that, if they do, unless they are at once put under arrest, and kept under arrest until the close of the inquiry, I shall decline to attend the proceedings."

I consider that, in these circumstances, Consul-General would be risking his life by appearing at the inquiry, and have informed the American Vice-Consul that, unless the accused are arrested, I must apply to your Lordship for instructions as to whether Mr. Wratislaw is to attend the proceedings.

No. 35.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 75.)
(Telegraphic.) P. *Foreign Office, October 26, 1905.*
URUMIA. You should concert with your United States' colleague in urging the Persian Government to take the necessary measures for arresting the Kurds mentioned in your telegram No. 136 of to-day.

Unless this is done His Majesty's Consul-General should not attend the inquiry.

No. 36.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 389.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, October 27, 1905.*
I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 721 of the 17th instant, relative to the complaint of the Persian Government that the Vazneh district of Soujboulak had been entered by Turkish troops.

I approve your proposal not to intervene in the matter unless the Persian Ambassador at Constantinople approaches you with a definite request for your good offices, and is able to make out a fair case in support of the claim advanced by the Persian Government to the territory in dispute.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 37.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received October 30.)

Sir, *India Office, October 28, 1905.*
IN reply to your letter of the 10th instant, regarding the claims of certain persons resident in Kernanshah to be treated as British subjects, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodriek to say that up to the year 1846, Kashmir was under the
[1598]

dominion of the Sikh Government, and not under the protection of the British authorities. Since that date, Kashmiris, although not British subjects, have become entitled to such protection abroad as is usually accorded to the subjects of the native States, but it is doubtful whether any persons, whose ancestors left Kashmir so long ago as seventy or eighty years, can have any claim to even that measure of protection.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

No. 38.

Sir C. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received October 31.)

(No. 639. Confidential.)

My Lord,

St. Petersburg, October 24, 1905.

WHEN I announced to Count Lamsdorff a few days ago my intention to leave St. Petersburg to-morrow on leave of absence, I told him that as it was a long time since I had had the honour of being received by the Emperor I thought that perhaps His Majesty might care to see me in case he should have any message or communication which he would like me to convey to the King.

Count Lamsdorff replied at once that he was sure that the Emperor would like to see me before I left, and an audience of His Majesty was promptly fixed for to-day at Peterhof.

On being received in private audience by the Emperor, I at once conveyed to His Majesty a message which I had received from the King expressing the warmth of his personal sentiments towards him, His Majesty's most earnest desire that the best and most durable relations should be established between England and Russia, and that all important points should be discussed in an amicable spirit and settled as soon as possible. I at the same time added that the King watched with interest the internal reforms which the Emperor had introduced and was about to grant, and that a liberal policy would be of the greatest advantage both to the Emperor himself and the Russian people.

At the same time I endeavoured to impress upon the Emperor the sincere desire of His Majesty's Government to maintain friendly relations with Russia, and I pointed out that complete unanimity prevailed in England on this subject, since it constitutes part of the policy not only of the Government, but also of the Opposition, while the press, without exception, was favourably disposed towards the idea. As evidence of the change of sentiment which had taken place I cited the presence in St. Petersburg of Lord Revelstoke, who, with the countenance of His Majesty's Government, was endeavouring to negotiate with an international group of bankers a loan to the Russian Government. I added that His Majesty's Government considered, and their opinion was shared by Count Lamsdorff, that in endeavouring to arrive at a settlement of all questions in dispute it would be better not to embark on an ambitious programme, but to deal with each question separately until all existing difficulties had been finally removed. The points of difference between the two countries were after all few in number, and not of a nature to render agreement impossible. I assured the Emperor that His Majesty's Government entertained no aggressive designs and no desire nor intention of extending the British frontiers beyond their present limits.

The Emperor expressed himself as very gratified at receiving the King's friendly message, and as being very desirous of arriving at a friendly agreement with England on all matters in dispute. He assured me that I might accept his word that neither he nor the Russian people desired a policy of expansion or extension of the Russian frontiers, that since both Powers were agreed on the maintenance of the integrity of Persia, all questions connected with Persia should be settled without delay, and that the only difficulties which could present themselves would be technical difficulties, such as spheres of influence, &c., which should be easily adjusted.

I remarked to the Emperor that, in the event of an Agreement being concluded between England and Russia, it was to be hoped that it would not be regarded as directed against any other Power, as has unfortunately been the case with regard to the Anglo-French Agreement and Morocco, that the desire for peace was deeply ingrained in the English people, and that, without seeking alliances in Europe England was anxious to be on friendly terms with all nations.

The Emperor expressed his assent, and observed that he had never understood why the Anglo-French Agreement had been regarded in Germany as directed against that country, and added that he regarded the recent revelations in the "Matin" as purely imaginary.

Referring to the Anglo-Japanese Agreement, His Majesty made a curious statement to the effect that objection had been taken to it by certain people in Russia as constituting a breach of neutrality, since the Agreement was signed before the conclusion of peace, and it was thought that this fact had given encouragement and moral support to the Japanese. He himself had not shared this view, but there were many who held it.

I told His Majesty that such an idea appeared to me to be very far-fetched, since in one of the Articles of the Agreement it was expressly stated that it was not to apply to the recently concluded war; that negotiations had been in progress since the month of April, and that it was a mere coincidence that the Agreement had been signed a few days before the conclusion of peace. It proved, however, to have been a fortunate coincidence, since it enabled the Japanese to make peace on terms that were acceptable to Russia, while without the safety assured to them by the Agreement, they would probably have preferred to continue the war. I alluded at the same time to the happy impression produced by the Emperor's recent Manifesto.

The audience lasted nearly an hour, during which the Emperor was pleased to discuss many other subjects of secondary importance, but before dismissing me, His Majesty asked me to convey a very friendly message to the King, expressing his entire acquiescence with the desires expressed in the King's message, and giving an assurance that the King could rely on him.

Altogether, the impression left on my mind by the interview was of a favourable nature, for the Emperor gave me a positive assurance that he was opposed to a policy of expansion, and appeared to reciprocate the desire for the maintenance of friendly relations between the two countries. In talking over the incidents which arose during the war he showed no rancour, nor in his reference to the Anglo-Japanese Agreement did he show any sign of ill-humour. The improvement which has already shown itself in the relations between England and Russia only requires careful fostering to bear fruit in due season.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CHARLES HARDINGE.

No. 39.

The Persian Transport Company to Foreign Office.—(Received November 1.)

3, Salter's Hall Court,

Canal Street, E.C., October 31, 1905.

Sir,

WITH reference to the recent serious robberies which have taken place on the Bakhtiari Road between Ahwaz and Isfahan, I would respectfully refer you to the last paragraph of Mr. Parry's letter, dated Ahwaz, 21st August, addressed to Sir Arthur Hardinge, copy of which letter was inclosed in my despatch to you of the 9th instant.

I now beg to report the receipt of information from our Tehran agents, to the effect that another serious robbery to a camel caravan has recently taken place on the Bakhtiari Road, with the result that merchants are becoming afraid to forward their goods by this route.

My Board would feel much obliged if His Majesty's Government could see their way to make strong representations to the Persian Government to prevent a recurrence of such outrages, which, if continued, will ruin the prospects of the road.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FRANK BOTTOMLEY,
Secretary.

No. 40.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 1.)

(No. 138.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 1, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Seistan Commission buildings.

I was recently asked by the Persian Government to sanction the removal of the buildings at Kukah, occupied by the Seistan Commission, the Persian Government promising to re-erect them if required hereafter.

The Government of India, to whom I referred the matter, replied that they would agree to their removal on condition of their re-erection by the Persian Government if required, and if I considered their retention likely to prejudice the Shah's acceptance of the Water Award, and was of opinion that this concession could be used to influence the Persian Government in favour of the Water Award.

As both His Majesty's Consul in Seistan and I were of opinion that it would be impolitic to retain these buildings, I came to a verbal Agreement with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, in the presence of Abbas Kuli Khan, to the effect that if, and when, the Persian Government gave me a written undertaking to re-erect the buildings, if required to do so hereafter, they might be removed.

The following telegram from His Majesty's Consul at Seistan reached me last night:—

"By order of the Yamin-i-Nizam, Mission buildings at Kukah have been destroyed by fire. I have informed him that his action was unfriendly and discourteous, and that I should complain of it, for these buildings, at the time of their destruction, were still in our occupation, and he gave me no previous intimation of his intention with regard to them.

"The Yamin's conduct is almost tantamount to an insult, and I think it would have a bad effect to overlook it, though I think he probably acted with the deliberate intention of courting complaint by us, with the idea of clearing himself of the charge of being too friendly to the English which is levelled at him."

I could not see the Mushir-ed-Dowleh last night, as we are now in Hamazan, but sent Abbas Kuli Khan to ask for explanations. Although I had several times insisted on the necessity of a written promise to re-erect from the Persian Government, the Mushir denied saying that he had ever made such a promise. He said that either the Shah or the Grand Vizier must have sent the order to burn the buildings without his knowledge.

I shall represent to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, whom I hope to see this afternoon, the discourteous nature of the Persian Government's action, which in this country will be looked upon as insulting, and I hope your Lordship will send me a strong message to the Persian Government.

No. 41.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 1.)

(No. 139.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 1, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Seistan Commission buildings.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh, whom I have seen, states that incident was result of a misunderstanding on his part, and much regrets what has happened. He will send the written undertaking to-morrow morning.

At the same time the conduct of the Persian Government in this matter appears so intolerable that I hope your Lordship will send me a strong message to them.

No. 42.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 2.)

Sir,

India Office, November 1, 1905.

IN reply to Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 25th instant, as to the action to be taken in connection with the capture by the Firman Firma of certain Lurs supposed to have been concerned in the attack on Colonel Douglas and Captain Lorimer, I am directed to state that Mr. Secretary Brodriek concurs in the instructions which the Marquess of Lansdowne proposes to issue to Mr. Grant Duff on the subject.

I am, &c.

(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 43.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 77.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, November 2, 1905.

HIS Majesty's Government are greatly surprised at the discourteous behaviour of the local Persian officials in demolishing the Seistan Commission buildings (as reported in your telegrams Nos. 138 and 139 of yesterday) without previously consulting or warning the Consul in charge.

You should inform the Persian Government of this, and add that His Majesty's Government expect suitable reparation will be made. We shall, of course, hold them to their promise if the buildings are hereafter required.

No. 44.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 5.)

(No. 141.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 5, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Arms for Meshed.

Your Lordship's telegram No. 73 of the 20th ultimo.

In a note which I received to-day in reply to my representations on this subject, the Persian Government state that compliance with our request would prejudice the result of negotiations which they are engaged in with the Russians for the removal of the arms imported by the latter. They therefore hope that, in view of the good relations existing between our respective Governments, we will not press the matter.

It is, in my opinion, improbable that the Russians will consent to remove their arms or that our importation will be sanctioned by the Persian Government.

His Majesty's Government must be prepared, if we import the arms by force, to find the Persian Government exhibiting a sulky temper for a time, but we have already to encounter so much obstruction that this can hardly make matters worse.

Our claims amount to at least 20,000*l.*, most of them from the Gulf, where some have been outstanding for ten years, and though the Grand Vizier appears more friendly since his return, he does nothing to settle them.

If we ever succeed in getting them paid by diplomatic pressure I shall be surprised. My foreign colleagues are beginning to talk of joint action, for they find the same difficulty in obtaining satisfaction.

No. 45.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 80.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, November 5, 1905.

FROM the photograph inclosed in Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 177 of the 5th August last, only one of the captives, Mir Kavi Khan, can be positively identified by Colonel Douglas and Captain Lorimer as having taken part in the attack upon them.

[1598]

H

We consider that it would be a mistake to execute one culprit, as others would thereby be deterred from surrendering, and we are therefore of opinion that the Firman Firman should be urged to endeavour to secure by negotiation more of the guilty parties by using the captives as hostages, or, should that fail, by resuming the operations which he promised should be undertaken after the harvest.

For the present the question of compensation need not be raised.

No. 46.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 211.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 3, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inclose correspondence regarding the Bakhtiari Road.

On receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 50 of the 28th March last, Sir Arthur Hardinge sent a copy of it to His Majesty's Consul-General at Ispahan for his observations.

Apparently Mr. Preece left Ispahan for Europe before receiving Sir Arthur Hardinge's despatch, which remained unanswered until I received Mr. Preece's telegram No. 34 to-day.

Your Lordship will see from that telegram that His Majesty's Consul-General considers the sums of 3,000 toman and 1,000 toman too much to be applied solely to the track, as distinct from the repairs and painting of the bridges.

Shortly after Mr. Preece passed through Tehran on his way to his post I received the letter from Messrs. Lynch's agent at Ahwaz (copy inclosed), stating that, in an interview with the Bakhtiari Khans, the latter complained of not having received a reply as to whether or not Messrs. Lynch Brothers had accepted the arrangements for the repairs to the road between Mr. Preece and themselves.

As Mr. Preece is about to proceed to the Bakhtiari country, it will be simpler for him to explain the situation to the Khans, and to endeavour to obtain the 4,000 toman from them for the work on the road next year.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 46.

Messrs. Lynch Brothers' Agent to Sir A. Hardinge.

Sir,

Ahwaz, August 21, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that on my way from Ispahan to Ahwaz I visited the Bakhtiari Chiefs at Chargarkor, and, in the course of an interview with his Excellency the Sirdar Assad, the following subjects were referred to in the sense given below:—

1. Arrangements for the Repairs to the Road made between the Chiefs and Mr. Preece.

His Excellency expressed surprise and annoyance because the Chiefs had received no reply as to whether Messrs. Lynch Brothers accepted the arrangement or not, and I gathered from the tone of his remarks that he thought that my principals were purposely withholding their reply.

I informed his Excellency that a reply had been sent to the Legation some months ago, but as I was not at liberty to disclose official communications to His Majesty's Minister, I could only say that I believed Messrs. Lynch Brothers had accepted the proposal under certain conditions which would not be difficult to arrange. His Excellency requested me to write to the Legation, expressing their wish to have the matter settled without delay.

In passing on his Excellency's remarks I desire to point out the importance of arriving at a prompt settlement, in order that the work of repair to the road can be commenced before the coming autumn.

The track further deteriorates every winter, and if we are compelled to defer the work of repair until next spring the small sum of 30,000 kran to be allotted to us for the purpose will not go very far.

2. Erection of Caravanserais to accommodate the Traffic.

I have already had the honour of drawing your attention to the necessity of getting more caravanserais erected on the road, for the accommodation of the traffic and the protection of goods during wet weather, and I recently took the liberty of suggesting that the opportunity of settling with the Chiefs with regard to the repairs to the track might be a good one to arrange with them to carry out their promise to erect the necessary buildings.

Should it be deemed expedient to couple these two matters when advising the Chiefs of Messrs. Lynch's conditional acceptance of the repair arrangement, I submit the following notes regarding the caravanserais needed for the information of the Legation.

Stages on the road, Ispahan to Ahwaz, with particulars of accommodation at each station:—

Stages.	Accommodation.
1. Ispahan.	Caravanserai.
2. Pulvagan	Poor accommodation in private houses.
3. Bistagan	" " "
4. Kavarukh	" " "
5. Karaghi	" " "
6. Ardal	Caravanserai in ruins, now being repaired.
7. Dopolun	" very bad condition.
8. Sarkhun	" good condition.
9. Shehli	" bad condition.
10. Dehdiz	" good condition.
11. Gudarzi-Balutak	" "
12. Malimur	Poor accommodation in houses.
13. Kuleh Tal	No accommodation.
14. Towla	" "
15. Jaru	" "
16. Alwanieh	" "
17. Walz	Fair accommodation in houses.
18. Ahwaz.	

At the stations where there are no caravanserais, loads are stacked in the open, and muleteers and their animals find shelter in houses belonging to private individuals.

To completely equip the road for the traffic which already is frequenting it caravanserais are much needed at the following places:—

1. Karaghi.
2. Kavarukh.
3. Ardal.
4. Gundumkar, between Dopolun and Sarkhun.
5. Kuleh Tal.
- 5 A. Jowla.
6. Jaru.
7. Alwanieh.

The Chiefs have no reasonable excuse on the ground of expense for not building them, as they now farm out the right to sell fodder and supplies at all the stations for an annual payment, the consequence being that Charvadars pay indirectly in the enhanced price of fodder and supplies for accommodation which is not afforded them.

3. Robberies on the Road.

Two serious robberies have recently taken place on the road near Maulwari Hill.

A caravan of loads from Ahwaz was raided about a month ago. Seventeen mules were stolen and half a load of piece-goods is missing. About twenty days later another caravan was robbed and several animals stolen.

The Chiefs informed me that they were taking strong steps to put a stop to these

robberies, but as the robbers are Kugaloos who inhabit the neighbourhood of Behbahan, they experienced considerable difficulty in punishing them. They further said that they got no assistance from the Governor of Fars, who rules the Province in which the Kugaloos are located, and requested me to solicit your assistance in representing this difficulty to the proper authorities.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FRASER PARRY,
Representing Messrs. Lynch Brothers.

Inclosure 2 in No. 46.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Preece.

(No. 23.)
(Telegraphic.) P.
BAKHTIARI Road.
Please send an answer to His Majesty's Minister's despatch No. 12 of the 12th May last by telegraph.

September 28, 1905.

Inclosure 3 in No. 46.

Consul-General Preece to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 34.)
(Telegraphic.) P.
BAKHTIARI Road.
Your telegram No. 23 of the 29th ultimo.
Persian Transport Company were correct in their views. I was of opinion that 3,000 and 1,000 tomans were sums too large to be devoted only to the tracks and not to the painting and repairs of the bridges. Good and adequate work can be carried out if repairs are done economically and intelligently, as suggested in my despatch No. 56 of the 30th December, 1904, and I cannot understand how the Chiefs can hold the Company responsible for the money, if this be done and His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Ahwaz approves of the work. I will explain all this to the Chiefs when I see them and hope to put the matter on a proper footing. Since it is now too late to do anything this year, I will try to induce them to give 4,000 tomans for the work next year.

The Chiefs have written to me on the subject of yearly pay, and state that they would prefer the payment of the money in Isfahan as being more convenient. I think that this concession should be made.

Inclosure 4 in No. 46.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Preece.

(No. 27.)
Sir,
I TRANSMIT to you herewith a copy of a communication from Messrs. Lynch Brothers' agent at Ahwaz, on the subject of an interview he has had with the Bakhtiari Khans.

The latter complain that they have never received information as to whether or not Messrs. Lynch have accepted the arrangement for the repairs of the road made by you last year.

Apparently Sir Arthur Hardinge's despatch No. 12, inclosing Messrs. Lynch's letter to the Foreign Office of the 22nd March last for your observations, reached Isfahan after your departure on leave, hence the delay.

I gather from your telegram of the 3rd instant that during your approaching visit to the Bakhtiari Khans you will explain to them how matters stand, and will endeavour to obtain the 4,000 tomans from them.

I request you also to call their attention to Messrs. Lynch's views about the erection of caravanserais to accommodate the traffic on the road.

I have already informed the Chiefs by letter of the representations I have made to the Persian Government regarding the insecurity of the road.

I have within the last few days again brought the condition of affairs to the notice of the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, and have warned his Excellency that on the next complaint I shall lay the matter before His Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

P.S.—I also inclose copy of a letter [I have addressed to Messrs. Lynch Brothers' agent at Ahwaz.

E. G. D.

Inclosure 5 in No. 46.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Messrs. Lynch Brothers' Agent.

Tehran, October 3, 1905.
Sir,
I HAVE received your letter to Sir A. Hardinge of the 21st August last, regarding the Bakhtiari Road.

His Majesty's Consul-General at Isfahan has returned from leave of absence, and will shortly have an opportunity of laying before the Bakhtiari Khans the various matters referred to in your communication under reply.

As regards the robberies on the road, your agent at Tehran has no doubt informed you of the repeated representations I have made to the Persian Government. I have now informed the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that on the next complaint I shall feel it my duty to bring the fact of the insecurity of the Bakhtiari Road to the knowledge of the Marquess of Lansdowne.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

No. 47.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 212. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 5, 1905.

IN confirmation of my telegram No. 123 of the 2nd instant, I have the honour to report that M. Naus, the Minister of Customs and Posts, left Tehran last Wednesday for Constantinople, where he is officially stated to be about to negotiate a Commercial Treaty with Turkey.

M. Naus' enemies, at the head of whom is the Mujtahed Seyed Abdullah, were awaiting the return of the Shah next Saturday to renew against him the agitation of last spring. They accuse him of having made a large fortune out of the customs, and also object to a Persian Government Department being in the hands of Europeans. The general impression here is that, even if M. Naus is innocent, a proportion of his staff, many of whom are his relatives and protégés, rob the State on a considerable scale.

I have already had the honour to give your Lordship my views in regard to the Belgian officials in Persia, in the Memorandum inclosed in Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 50, Secret, of the 4th March last. It is obvious that one cannot intrust a number of needy low-caste European adventurers with the administration of the customs of a country such as Persia (where every one, from the Shah downwards, rubs with both hands) without risking abuses, but, on the whole, I do not think that the Belgians have speculated more than other Europeans of a similar class would have done. Personally, I much regret M. Naus' departure. I have always been on the best of terms with him, and his prompt business-like methods contrast strongly with the procrastination, ineptitude, and crooked ways of the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, the Grand Vizier, and other Persian officials with whom I have to struggle.

I went last Saturday to take leave of M. Naus, and he informed me that he would only be away four months. He said he had told the Shah that he had no wish to be a thorn in the side of the Persian Government, and had offered to resign, but His Majesty had been most cordial to him, and had refused to entertain the idea of placing the control of the customs in the hands of any other person.

It is perhaps thought that during the temporary absence of M. Naus the agitation

against him may subside; but it is generally believed here that his departure for Constantinople is merely a preliminary step to his leaving Persia for ever.

The Mashir-ed-Dowleh informed me yesterday that M. Naus would not be away more than three or four months, and, as his wife and family remain here, this may be the case.

M. Priem, formerly Director of Customs in Tabreez, will, for the present, act as Administrator of the Customs.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

No. 48.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 213. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 5, 1905.

IN the last monthly summary of events in Persia (forwarded to your Lordship in Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 207 of the 12th September), reference was made, under the heading of "Seistan," to an attempt to organize an anti-British demonstration at Bunjar, the origin of the movement being attributed to the Russian Consulate.

I have now the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a letter addressed by His Majesty's Consul in Seistan to the Government of India, giving further details as to the alleged intrigue, and inclosing a copy of a letter which is believed to have emanated from the Russian Consulate, and calculated to excite popular feeling against the British on account of the Seistan Water Award.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 48.

Consul Macpherson to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Seistan, September 11, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for your information, with reference to diary entry for the 27th August, and in continuation of my letter dated the 11th August, a copy, with translation, of what is believed to be the real letter written by the Russian Mirza to Ali Jan of Bunjar.

The copy of the Persian text attached is practically a facsimile of the handwriting of the original document, being a tracing of it taken by Mahomed Ashraf Khan over a lamp. Ali Jan, who personally brought the letter, was afraid to part with the original, and hence the above device.

The general style of the letter, its literary merit, the formation of a number of the letters in the Arabic style, and the use of certain rather uncommon expressions, such as [Arabic sign omitted] for "complaint," which no Seistani ordinarily employs, and the fact that the letter itself is written in a disguised hand all point, I think, to its undoubted authenticity.

If further proof of this were required it is to be found in the general similarity of its contents with those of the article recently published in the "Habl-ul-Matin" in the issue of the 24th July (*vide* Seistan Series, Part VII. No. 22), which must have been composed and dispatched from here about the same time, *i.e.*, towards the end of June, that the letter was written.

One of the objects of the Russian Consul summoning the principal Syads and malcontents of Bunjar, according to Ali Jan, was the organization of a monster petition from the people to the Shah against the acceptance of the Water Award, the terms of which are being misrepresented here in the most mischievous manner. It is alleged, for instance, that the irrigation officer who will come to Seistan will be backed by an armed force, and that his object will be to divert the entire waters of the Helmund from the present channel to Afghanistan and the Tarakham tract, which latter the British themselves will cultivate.

Another ingenious misrepresentation is that the object of giving Persia only one-third of the water is to dry up the Hamun so that the cattle and flocks of Seistan

which at present find much rich grazing there may all perish and the country be ruined.

Some colour is unfortunately given to the foregoing statements by our retention of the old Mission huts at Kuhak and the establishment of a levy post there. As it seems desirable at the present juncture, and pending the acceptance of the Water Award, to avoid every cause of suspicion, I have recommended in my telegram No. 8 to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires, and repeated to the Government of India, the withdrawal of the above post and the relinquishment of the buildings. The latter are not of any real value, and if it is found necessary hereafter to provide the irrigation officer with a house in the neighbourhood of Kuhak, it would be better, I think, to build a new one for him rather than accentuate the present suspicions by retaining the Mission buildings.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to His Britannic Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. D. MACPHERSON,
Captain.

Inclosure 2 in No. 48.

Letter addressed by the Russian Mirza to Ali Jan.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

I ASK you to send me the names of the people who formerly entertained complaints against the British Consulate officials on account of their oppressing them and treating them badly.

Also tell them all that the proper time for doing such things is the present, particularly that the Persian officials are willing in this matter. If not, then they should come to the city and have a talk with me personally. I am always ready to be at their service, be it in Seistan or in Tehran, because I know, by God, that they will stop the waters of the Helmund from coming to Seistan, and will make it run to Hauzdar—two parts of it will be given to Afghanistan, and not a single drop will reach Seistan. They have made Seistan such a bad place now that all of you will not get a single morsel of bread or a drop of water. Another army is coming here to stop the water; so you should be careful and watchful. I do not wish to say any more, but that they should come here, so that I may tell them something useful and secret myself.

No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 214. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 8, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith correspondence regarding the present position of the Urmi murder case.

As I had the honour to report in my telegram No. 119 of the 29th ultimo, the Persian Government have at length appointed a Commissioner named Baghir Khan, who will proceed to Urmi and make an inquiry into the Labaree murder and the attack on Captain Gough. Baghir Khan has already reached Tabreez, and will at an early date leave for his destination.

I have lately had some difficulty with Mr. Pearson, my United States' colleague, who is quite unacquainted with Persian methods, and persists in dealing with the Urmi question as if the Kurds were New England farmers and the Persian Government a civilized Power. There are also other complications. Last year the members of the American Presbyterian Mission at Tehran petitioned the President of the United States for the removal of Mr. Pearson from office on the ground that he was "habitually drunk in public," and generally led a scandalous life. President Roosevelt appears, after examining the matter, to have decided that the missionaries had not proved their case;

but the relations between the United States' Legation and the Mission remain extremely strained. The Urmi missionaries, who belong to the same body as those in Tehran, consider, rightly or wrongly, that Mr. Pearson has grossly mismanaged the negotiations with the Persian Government in regard to the Labaree murder, and I gather that their correspondence with that gentleman has from the first assumed an acrimonious character.

After the way he has been treated by his fellow-countrymen in Persia, it is, perhaps, not surprising that Mr. Pearson should view all statements and information emanating from the missionaries with suspicion; but, without wishing to appear uncharitable, I cannot help thinking that his detestation of these worthy people has warped his judgment, and that latterly he has shown a tendency to leave His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez to protect the United States' interests without affording that officer the support to which he is justly entitled.

A further difficulty arose owing to the sudden death from typhoid fever of Dr. Cochran, the head of the American Presbyterian Mission at Urmi, who was to have represented United States' interests at the inquiry. Dr. Cochran, who had lived over twenty years at Urmi, was eminently qualified to carry out his duties and to induce witnesses to come forward. I fear his death has greatly lessened the probability of a satisfactory issue. On Dr. Cochran's death the United States' Vice-Consul here being distrusted by his Chief, and being a British subject of indifferent reputation—there appeared to me no course but for Mr. Wratislaw to continue to deal with the case, and I gave him instructions accordingly.

In my opinion the most serious point at issue is this: It is really British and not American prestige which will suffer if the inquiry proves a fiasco. The people of Azerbaijan know and care nothing about the United States, and when they see the British Consul-General attempting to bring Mr. Labaree's murderers to justice they will inevitably identify us with the case. It is on this account that I ventured in my telegram No. 119 to urge your Lordship to bring strong pressure, if it becomes necessary, to force the Persian Government to take efficient measures to bring the assailants of Captain Gough to justice.

As the murder of Mr. Labaree mainly concerns the United States' Government, it was clearly necessary that Mr. Pearson should give explicit instructions to his representative as to the attitude to be assumed at the trial of the accused Kurds. His views, as stated in his letter to me of the 18th ultimo, appear somewhat vague, but up to the present I have been unable to provide Mr. Wratislaw with more satisfactory instructions. That Mr. Wratislaw should act as prosecutor of the Kurds seems to me undesirable. The witnesses, in spite of the Mushir-ed-Dowleh's assurances to the contrary, will almost certainly be intimidated, and may, as Mr. Wratislaw thinks, even go back on their depositions. In Persia, in such cases, it is usually best to prove the fact of the crime and then leave the Persian Government to arrest and punish the guilty parties. This course will be followed by Mr. Wratislaw in the case of the attack on Captain Gough, but I have so far apparently been unable to persuade Mr. Pearson that this is the only plan likely to lead to satisfactory results. I fear that he will only too soon discover that he is not dealing with the High Court of Justice of the United States.

As regards the attack on Captain Gough, our case seems very weak. He cannot identify the persons who shot at him, and, this being so, I have informed him, with Mr. Wratislaw's concurrence, that his presence at Urmi will serve no useful purpose. All we can do is to prove the fact of the outrage—and Captain Gough's report is sufficient evidence of this—and then leave Baghir Khan to arrest and punish the persons concerned.

Your Lordship may be certain that the Persian Government, and more especially the Valiahd, will do all in their power to whitewash the Kurds, and I venture to think that it is important, especially for His Majesty's Government, to insist on the facts of both cases being properly sifted.

Your Lordship will see from the correspondence inclosed that I am pressing for the Urmi Mujtehed to be sent to Tehran, and for the Majid-es-Sultaneh to be allowed to leave Persia. At present I have received no replies from the Persian Government regarding these questions.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 49.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 39.)

Sir,

Tabreez, September 7, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that Nizam-es-Sultaneh has informed me confidentially that he has received a letter from the Valiahd stating that everything connected with the Urmi case is to remain in suspense until the Shah's return. This being so, it will, perhaps, be better that I should meanwhile postpone any decisive action on behalf of Majid-es-Sultaneh.

Neither Nizam-es-Sultaneh nor the Karguzar have received any instructions regarding the inquiry into the murder of Mr. Labaree, which is to be held at Urmi, nor do they know anything concerning the supposed arrest of Saidi and Fathullah.

The United States' Minister has telegraphed to the American missionaries asking them to "wire name of suitable American to watch and report proceedings of the trial in place of Dr. Cochran." The missionaries have declined to do so, on the ground that, "in order that such a trial should be effective, it is plainly necessary that the accused persons be arrested, that the Court be impartial, and that there be full protection to witnesses," none of which conditions they consider likely to be fulfilled. They are also averse to come forward as apparent prosecutors in the case, and so put their own persons and the interests of their work in danger.

Should the inquiry take place, I think that it is desirable that it be postponed till the snow has fallen and blocked all the roads leading to the Turkish frontier, as the Begzade will then be completely in the hands of the Persian Government in case the latter really desire to deal effectively with them.

I have taken note of your instructions that I should be present at the inquiry so far as it concerns the attack on Captain Gough, and I propose to start for Urmi as soon as the Persian Commissioner leaves Tabreez. I trust, however, that my functions may be confined to watching British interests, and not be extended so as to include the American case.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. C. WRATISLAW.

Inclosure 2 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Dear Mr. Pearson,

Gulahek, September 15, 1905.

IN a despatch which I have just received from Mr. Wratislaw, he suggests that the trial at Urmi of the murderers of Mr. Labaree should be postponed until snow has fallen and blocked all the roads leading to the Turkish frontier, as the Begzade will then be completely in the hands of the Persian Government, in case the latter really desire to deal effectively with them.

May I ask for an expression of your views on this point. It seems to me a very sensible suggestion.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 3 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Wratislaw.

(No. 18.)

Sir,

Gulahek, September 16, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith two letters from the United States' Minister on the subject of the Urmi murder trial.

Mirza Baghir Khan, the Persian Commissioner, left here on the 11th instant for Tabreez. The Mushir-ed-Dowleh instructed him to call on me before his departure, but he failed to do so. As I informed you in my telegram No. 36 of the 15th instant, in the absence of a competent American Representative at Urmi, you will have to watch the case on behalf of the United States' Government.

[1598]

K

I have to-day asked Mr. Pearson to furnish me with his views as to your attitude at the trial, and I shall at once send you a copy of his reply for your guidance.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 4 in No. 49.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Dear Mr. Grant Duff, *American Legation, Tehran, September 12, 1905.*
HUSSEIN KULI KHAN has called to present the Commissioner appointed to try the Kurds. His name is Mirza Baghir Khan Mostashar, and he left, as I was informed, for his mission yesterday.

He asked me who would represent my Government at the trial, and I told him that owing to Dr. Cochran's death, and the lack of a suitable person to take his place, our interests, through the good offices of the British Legation, would be intrusted to the British Consul at Tabreez.

Mirza Baker startled me by the unprovoked assurance that he was an absolutely honest man, and that he would never accept a bribe even under the strongest temptations. I replied that I assumed that his high character and established probity were the motive for his appointment to such a delicate mission.

I also told him that I had understood that these Kurds would be willing to pay liberally for their freedom, and that they were even willing to pay Mrs. Labaree the 20,000 dollars conditionally abated from the indemnity, but that my Government would never assent to any such disposition of the case and shocking failure of justice.

With reference to my refusal to protect Majid-es-Sultaneh, I wish to quote the words of the Treaty in force between the United States and Persia.

Article VII contains the following: "The Diplomatic Agent or Consuls of the United States shall not protect secretly or publicly the subjects of the Persian Government."

As Consul-General Wratislaw was surprised and disappointed by my attitude, I shall thank you to send him this note, or a copy of it.

Sincerely, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 5 in No. 49.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Dear Mr. Grant Duff, *September 15, 1905.*
In reply to your note of to-day, I beg to say that I cannot well ask the Persian Government to postpone the trial till next winter, in view of the fact that the Commissioner has already left Tehran and is on the way to Urmi, and the Government would make my request an excuse for not fulfilling their engagements by the 9th March.

Again, the only object of the postponement would be to capture Saidi Beg and Fathullah Beg, and I have the most positive assurances that these men will be caught and tried "along with the others." I am holding the Persian Government responsible for the result of the trial rather than the date or method of trial, and the only acceptable result will be the conviction and punishment of the guilty.

The missionaries have refused to take any part in the proceedings, but the Commissioner assured me that Mr. Wratislaw would be afforded every facility to see that the truth is ascertained and the demands of justice satisfied.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 6 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Dear Mr. Pearson, *Gulahek, September 16, 1905.*
I SHOULD be obliged if you would let me know, at your early convenience, what attitude you desire Mr. Wratislaw to take up at the trial at Urmi. The Labaree murder case mainly concerns the United States' Government, and in these circumstances I should be obliged if you would furnish me with precise details as to how you wish the case conducted.

I have received, and thank you for, your letter of the 15th instant.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 7 in No. 49.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Dear Mr. Grant Duff, *American Legation, September 18, 1905.*
I HAVE received your letter of the 16th instant, asking my views as to the attitude which Mr. Wratislaw should maintain at the trial of the Kurds.

I take it for granted that his position will be that of an intelligent observer and reporter of the proceedings; that he will note the names of witnesses, the essential questions asked and the answers; that he will suggest the calling of such witnesses as may be able to furnish material testimony and the presentation of such circumstances as may tend to fix the guilt upon the real authors of the crime. The material for such suggestions, I assume, will be given to Mr. Wratislaw by the missionaries, unless they decide to show an absolute indifference to the result of the trial and the conviction of its perpetrators.

I finally am confident that Mr. Wratislaw will make a concise and clear summary of the rulings and findings of the Commissioner, and his report will satisfy both your Legation and me that there has been a proper execution or an evident miscarriage of justice.

Believe me, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 8 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Gulahek, September 21, 1905.
HIS Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez, in a despatch received yesterday, informs me that some time ago he forwarded to the local authorities for registration a contract recently entered into between Mr. H. F. Stevens, a British subject, and the Majid-es-Sultaneh.

The Persian authorities in Azerbaijan refuse to register the said contract, alleging orders from the Central Government at Tehran.

As Mr. Wratislaw's application is in accordance with Article 2 of the separate compact relative to commerce, &c., referred to in Article X of the Treaty of Turkomanchai, I have the honour to ask your Excellency to favour me with the reasons which actuated the Government of Azerbaijan in refusing to comply with Mr. Wratislaw's request.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 9 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Wratislaw.

(No. 20.)

Sir,

Gulahek, September 23, 1905.
I TRANSMIT to you herewith correspondence with the United States' Minister on the subject of the Urmi murder case.

I request you to inform me whether you consider Mr. Pearson's views as to the manner in which you are to conduct the case on behalf of the United States' Government sufficiently explicit.

● I also inclose copy of a note which I have addressed to the Persian Government regarding the refusal of the Azerbaijan authorities to register the contract recently entered into between Mr. H. F. Stevens and the Majid-es-Sultaneh.

I am, &c.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 10 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Gulahak, September 28, 1905.

BEFORE leaving for Europe His Highness the Atabeg-i-Azam gave assurances to His Majesty's Minister that Haji Mirza Hosein Agha, the Urmi Mujtehed, would be sent to Tehran. As the inquiry into the Urmi murder case and the attack on Major Gough are soon to take place, I attach importance to this man's removal from Azerbaijan, where, from his relative proximity to the scene of the inquiry, he may be able to make mischief.

I would ask your Excellency to be so good as to inform me when the Persian Government proposes to fulfil the assurances on the subject given to Sir A. Hardinge.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 11 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Gulahak, September 28, 1905.

YOU recently informed me that His Imperial Highness the Valiahd had asked permission from His Imperial Majesty the Shah for the Majid-es-Sultaneh to proceed to Europe.

In view of the fact that His Majesty's Consul-General will soon be obliged to leave Tabreez in order to be present at the Urmi inquiry, I request your Excellency to be so good as to inform me as soon as possible of His Majesty's decision.

I note your Excellency's verbal assurance to me that, should the Majid-es-Sultaneh leave the British Consulate-General, neither he nor his property will be molested.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 12 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Gulahak, September 28, 1905.

HIS Majesty's Consul-General reports that Baghir Khan, the Commissioner appointed by the Persian Government to inquire into the Urmi murder case, informs him that he has received no instructions to make investigations into the circumstances of the attack on Major Gough.

This is evidently an accidental omission on the part of the Persian Government, and I would request your Excellency to be so good as to send early instructions to Baghir Khan to include in his labours an inquiry into the outrage on His Majesty's Acting Consul at Urmi.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 13 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Dear Mr. Pearson,

Gulahak, September 28, 1905.

I SEND you herewith paraphrase of a telegram I received to-day from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez on the subject of the Urmi murder case.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 14 in No. 49.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tabreez, September 27, 1905.

URMI inquiry.

Persian Commissioner and Kurds who were imprisoned at Tehran have arrived here.

I concluded from a long conversation which I had to-day with the former that Persian Government has directed him to treat all evidence against the Kurds as tainted, and to whitewash them as far as possible. Baghir Khan further states that he has no instructions to examine the case of Captain Gough's attack.

As the Karguzar is still trying to shirk the job, I do not think that we shall start before another fortnight. I wish also to arrange for departure of Majid before leaving, and request you to endeavour to carry this out.

It is essential in my opinion that, until inquiry is over at any rate, Kurds should go to Urmi, not as honoured guests, but as prisoners. This point should be secured by Mr. Pearson.

Inclosure 15 in No. 49.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Dear Mr. Grant Duff,

Tehran, September 30, 1905.

I RECEIVED your note inclosing paraphrase of telegram from Mr. Wratislaw.

As I look at the matter, if the Persian Government treats the Kurd prisoners as "guests of honour," that fact would be the best evidence that these men were virtually acquitted before leaving Tehran, and that the trial was intended to be a farce and a fraud.

If this view is sound, a complaint on this account would be much more effective after, rather than before, the anticipated manner of treatment.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 16 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Sir,

Tehran, October 1, 1905.

I INCLOSE herewith a paraphrase of a telegram from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez on the subject of the Urmi inquiry.

I request you to be so good as to favour me with your views in regard to Mr. Wratislaw's telegram.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 17 in No. 49.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tabreez, October 1, 1905.

FROM various confidential sources I learn Baghir Khan has told Kurds and Urmi Mollahs he will insure them against further molestation.

I was visiting Governor-General yesterday when message came from Kurds asking for leave to return to their homes as they were no longer wanted. Although not yet favoured with views of United States' Minister on this matter, I stated that consequence to all concerned would be most serious if these men were not taken as prisoners to Urmi.

It would, I think, increase prospect of satisfactory result of inquiry, and also do away with growing impression that things are going against us, if Urmi Mollahs were brought to Tehran at once.

I am every day more certain of Baghir Khan's incompetency and want of good faith.

Inclosure 18 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Sir,

Tehran, October 2, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith paraphrase of a telegram from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez regarding the forthcoming inquiry at Urmi into the murder of Mr. Labaree and the attack on Captain Gough.

I entirely concur with Mr. Wratislaw's views, and request you to be so good as to favour me with your opinion on the various points referred to in the inclosed telegram.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 19 in No. 49.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tabreez, October 1, 1905.

WITH reference to the instructions from the American Minister, contained in despatch No. 20, I gather that I am expected by the American Minister to do much more than watch the case on his behalf, that I am, in fact, to act as prosecutor instructed by the American missionaries, holding a brief, in fact, for the American Government. If you approve, I shall, of course, comply and do my utmost, but I have already explained to you my reluctance to be forced into such a position, and I should like to be assured by the American Minister that in the exercise of the wide discretion which he leaves me my action will receive his support. In particular, I must decline to suggest the names of the witnesses (so far as those are concerned who made depositions before me last year) unless an undertaking be given by the American Minister that these unfortunate people shall not be subsequently persecuted. I believe, as a matter of fact, that unless they are assured of protection they will go back on their depositions.

I should also be glad of an assurance on the following point, which, I think, is essential: that the Kurds now here should be kept in custody until after the inquiry, and should not be released even then without the American Minister's consent. If Baghir maintains his present attitude a miscarriage of justice is almost a foregone conclusion. Unless he is forbidden to release the Kurds he will probably do so. They travelled from Tehran with all honour and are at present free to all appearances.

It must be remembered that if I, His Majesty's Consul-General, attend at Urmi and attempt to guide the case it will be British and not American prestige which is at stake. It is useless for me to protest that I am only acting as Representative of the United States, for the Persians only understand what they see.

Unless the American Minister puts his foot down, it appears inevitable to me that I shall only become a laughing-stock by going to Urmi, and I naturally object strongly to the prospect.

If, as I fear will be the case, Baghir's proceedings are manifestly improper and tend to reduce the whole inquiry to a farce, am I to decline to take further part in it, or must I sit it out to the bitter end?

The American missionaries, I have no doubt whatever, would help me in every possible way.

Inclosure 20 in No. 49.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 3, 1905.

I HAVE received your note of the 28th ultimo, saying that, according to the reports received by you from the British Consul-General at Tabreez, Mirza Baghir Khan, the official sent to Urmi, has informed him that he has no orders respecting the case of Major Gough. Orders have been issued, and, to press the matter, I have telegraphed to him on the subject.

I avail, &c.

Inclosure 21 in No. 49.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

My dear Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, October 5, 1905.

I BEG to acknowledge your note of the 2nd instant, inclosing a telegram from Consul-General Wratislaw in regard to his representing the American Government at the approaching trial of the Kurds.

Since the receipt of your note I have communicated with my Government, and have had an interview with the Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs, in order to reach a definite understanding with regard to the protection of native witnesses whose testimony is essential to the ascertainment of the truth in this case.

I inclose a copy of my formal demand presented yesterday to Mushir-ed-Dowleh, who at once telegraphed instructions to the Governor of Urmi to the effect that he give public notice that the Persian Government will protect and save harmless all witnesses who may be called to testify in the case.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh also assured me that the accused Kurds would be kept in custody, and would not be released unless and until they should be acquitted after thorough investigation of the facts.

In reference to the powers of Mr. Wratislaw, Mushir-ed-Dowleh declared that, as the Representative of the American Government, Mr. Wratislaw would be consulted by the Persian Commissioner, and the two would draw up in writing a form of Agreement or Protocol setting forth the necessary steps and proper measures and procedure to be followed in the trial.

I shall furnish you a copy of Mushir-ed-Dowleh's written reply as soon as received.

I realize the force of Mr. Wratislaw's position in regard to the protection of witnesses, not only from ill-treatment, but from the fear of ill-treatment, and I cabled my Government to ask if I might guarantee such protection. The reply is as clear and as positive as the language of the Treaty, forbidding me so to do, but insisting that this duty devolves upon the Persian Government, and its faithful exercise should be resolutely demanded.

I wish to assure you, my dear Sir, that my Government appreciates your generous offer of good offices in this emergency, and it appreciates fully the difficult and embarrassing task that you are imposing on His Britannic Majesty's Consul-General Wratislaw.

Believe me, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON

Inclosure 22 in No. 49.

Mr. Pearson to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

American Legation, Tehran, October 4, 1905.

IN the matter of the approaching trial of the Kurds implicated in the murder of Mr. Labaree, the British Consul-General at Tabreez informs me that witnesses are afraid to testify against the Kurds unless guaranteed protection. I have therefore to ask, with all urgency, that you telegraph instructions to the Governor of Urmi to the effect that he give public notice that he will protect and save harmless the witnesses who are required to testify at the trial. In the event that you cannot guarantee adequate protection to such witnesses, will you waive any objection to my Government's making such guarantee and taking the necessary steps to enforce the same?

Your Excellency is aware that since we reached a basis of settlement in this case, on the 3rd January, 1905, I have not troubled you about trifles or formalities, but this question is vital and goes to the heart of the matter. It means the success or failure of the trial; and you will allow me to recall the words in which, on the 3rd January, you pledged the honour and good faith of your Government, to wit:—

"With respect to the other persons implicated in this murder, whoever of them shall be found within the Government and jurisdiction of Persia shall, by the 9th March, 1906, be arrested and brought to trial and punished according to the measure of their guilt."

I have been led to believe that the Kurdish tribes in sympathy with the accused are willing to pay the widow of Mr. Labaree the 20,000 dollars which was conditionally abated from the indemnity, and that the prisoners expect release on such terms; but I now notify your Excellency in the most emphatic terms that my Government will never assent to or even consider such a disposition of the case. Gold cannot atone for American blood. "Punishment according to the measure of their guilt" is the only reparation which my Government will accept, and for this it relies on the strict performance of the pledge above set forth, in which you solemnly bind the honour and faith of Persia.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 23 in No. 49.

Mr. Pearson to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, October 5, 1905.

IN reply to your inquiry of the 3rd instant, I have the honour to state that I had designated Dr. J. P. Cochran to represent my Government at the trial of the Kurds, but that owing to his death, and in the absence of an American Consular officer in Azerbaijan, the British Legation has courteously instructed Mr. A. C. Wratishaw, His Britannic Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez, to proceed to Urmi and to represent the American Government at the trial.

Your Excellency has been good enough to express verbally the assent of your Government to the selection of Mr. Wratishaw for the purpose indicated, and I have so informed the British Legation.

I have, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 24 in No. 49.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Wratishaw.

(No. 21.)

Sir,

Tehran, October 6, 1905.

I COMMUNICATED to the United States' Minister a paraphrase of your telegram of the 1st instant recording your views in regard to the approaching inquiry at Urmi into the circumstances of Mr. Labaree's murder.

I inclose herewith Mr. Pearson's reply, from which you will see that he has induced

the Mushir-ed-Dowleh to order the Governor of Urmi to give public notice that the Persian Government will protect all witnesses who may give evidence at the trial. The Persian Government has also assured Mr. Pearson that the accused Kurds will be kept in custody and will not be released unless and until they have been acquitted after a thorough investigation of the facts.

I gather from conversation with Mr. Pearson and from the inclosed correspondence that previous to the inquiry Baghir Khan and yourself will consult as to the form of procedure and draw up a Protocol in writing settling this matter.

The United States' Minister telegraphed to his Government in regard to the protection of witnesses. The United States' Government decline to guarantee their safety, as being contrary to the stipulations of their Treaty with Persia, but they will, I understand, insist on adequate protection for the witnesses being afforded by the Persian Government.

I have to-day telegraphed to you the main points of Mr. Pearson's letter sent herewith.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

No. 50.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 215.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 9, 1905.

AS I had the honour to report in my telegram No. 113 of the 14th ultimo, the Mushir-ed-Dowleh informed me on the evening of the preceding day that 20,000 Persian subjects, mostly Moslems, were homeless and starving at Baku, and that he proposed to instruct the Persian Representative there to ship these persons to Resht.

While deprecating any wish to interfere with his Excellency's arrangements, I pointed out that it appeared to me highly undesirable to flood Northern Persia with refugees, who might not improbably revenge themselves on the Christians living in this country for the misfortunes they had suffered at Baku. I recommended his Excellency, at all events temporarily, to prevent these people from landing at the Persian ports on the Caspian, or from crossing the frontier. I added that, as the Russian Government were responsible for the state of affairs at Baku, it was surely their duty to provide for Persian subjects till suitable arrangements in this respect could be made by the Persian Government.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh, though keenly alive in a general way to the possibility of the Baku disturbances spreading to Persia, had apparently not considered the danger of turning loose thousands of infuriated and starving Mahomedans among a fanatical and excitable population belonging to that religion. His Excellency promised to refer the matter to the Shah, and, if possible, to act according to my advice. The Persian Government, however, did nothing, and at least 9,000 of the refugees have arrived in Gilan.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh, I think rightly, does not anticipate trouble at Tehran, but he frankly confessed to me that if serious and continued anti-Christian disturbances took place in the capital the army might side with the mob.

The three towns where his Excellency thinks matters might take a serious turn are Tabreez, Meshed, and Ispahan, all of which are notorious for the fanaticism of their inhabitants.

From reports which I have received recently from His Majesty's Consuls-General at the two former places it would appear that the local authorities have been much alarmed at the possibility of an anti-Christian outbreak, but that the excitement is now subsiding. By the instructions of His Majesty's Minister, then visiting Meshed, I asked the Persian Government to increase the garrison of that town by a regiment of Timuri cavalry. These soldiers are Sunnis, and consequently not averse, if necessary, to shooting their Shiah coreligionists. I understand that the Persian Government has acted in accordance with my wishes.

As I have heard nothing to the contrary, I presume that Ispahan is quiet. There has been much talk here among the more turbulent spirits of what they intend to do to avenge the comparatively small numbers of Moslems massacred at Baku, but I do not think serious trouble is probable. The Tehrani is generally a coward, and would not

willingly attack the Legations, to which the Armenians would certainly fly if in real danger.

I have the honour to inclose such correspondence as I have had on this subject with the Persian Government.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 50.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Gulabek, September 14, 1905.

IN view of our conversation of yesterday's date, regarding the possible spread to Persia of the anti-Christian agitation now prevalent in the Caucasus, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that His Majesty's Government hold the Persian Government responsible for any injury to the lives and property of British subjects residing or carrying on business in this country.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 2 in No. 50.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Gulabek, September 29, 1905.

I HEAR from a reliable source that a large number of Persian refugees from Baku are arriving in Ghilan and other districts in Northern Persia.

I recently had the honour of drawing your Excellency's attention to the undesirability of allowing these persons to come to Persia. They will certainly spread the news of the events at Baku in all directions, and thereby still further excite their coreligionists, who, as your Excellency admitted to me, are already freely discussing the possibility of making reprisals. The steps to be taken to prevent anti-Christian agitation in this country are mainly the concern of the Persian Government, but I think it my duty to bring the matter again before your Excellency, and to point out the risk involved by permitting infuriated and half-starved refugees in large numbers to mingle with a population already excited by agitators and fanatics.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 3 in No. 50.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 8, 1905.

WITH reference to your notes of the 14th and 29th ultimo, I have the honour to inform you that the Persian Government has taken every possible step to prevent trouble and excitement, and, as you are aware, a few months ago necessary orders were sent to all the Governors of the provinces on the matter, and the local authorities have taken suitable measures; but how is it possible that, after the present incident between the Moslems and Armenians at Baku and other towns in the Caucasus, a large number of despoiled people who are obliged to return to their own country should be prevented from doing so? Such a measure is quite impossible.

I avail, &c.

No. 51.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 216. Confidential.)

Tehran, October 9, 1905.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to inclose herewith copy of a letter I received on the 28th ultimo from His Majesty's Minister, instructing me to forward to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh an official note and a private letter on the subject of the Seistan Water Award.

By direction of His Majesty's Minister I signed in his name the translations of these documents, which are inclosed.

As I had the honour to report in my telegram No. 127 of the 7th October, the Shah and the Grand Vizier returned to Tehran last Saturday and I have already applied for an interview with the latter, at which I shall endeavour to obtain further information regarding the reasons which have influenced His Majesty the Shah in refusing to accept Colonel MacMahon's Award.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 51.

Sir A. Hardinge to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,

Meshed, September 9, 1905.

I TRANSMIT herewith, and request you to send in translation to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh the two inclosed notes, one official and the other personal, respecting the Seistan Water Award.

It is possible that you may have received instructions from London in a sense inconsistent with the suggestions made in these notes or that the situation, by the time they reach you, may have been attended with new developments; in this case you will of course abstain from transmitting them to his Excellency. There will, however, be no harm in your doing so, should you have also received instructions to make and have made representations in the same sense, as the expression of my views, formulated independently, may indirectly help to strengthen that of your own. But in this matter I must leave a certain amount of latitude to your discretion. You should send a copy of this despatch and of its inclosures to London in the event of your acting on the above direction and forwarding the notes to the Persian Government.

I have, &c.
(Signed) ARTHUR H. HARDINGE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 51.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

(Private.)

Your Excellency,

Meshed, September 9, 1905.

I WROTE to you to-day officially, though not under instructions and therefore to some extent on my personal responsibility, about the Seistan Water question. There are a few words which I would wish to add in the strictest confidence and which will be best inserted in a private letter. I earnestly hope that whatever decision the Persian Government may come to on this question will not be influenced by foreign advice. I have reason to believe from information which reaches me from Seistan that in addition to the objections made by the Yamin-i-Nizam, the Karguzar, of whose unfriendliness to us and subservience to the Russian Consulate I have had so often to complain, has written to Tehran at the Russian Consul's inspiration, misrepresenting the entire character of the Award, and endeavouring to prejudice the Persian Government against it. Your Excellency knows as well as I do that the object of the Russian Representative is not so much to insure an arrangement satisfactory to Persia as to promote disunion and mistrust between our two Governments, and it would be a great misfortune if in the present instance those efforts were allowed to be attended with any measure of success. I need not remind you of the attempts made two years ago by the Russian Legation to interfere in the settlement of these disputes or of the false rumours which

were circulated as to the intention of Colonel MacMahon to hand over Miankangi to Afghanistan, and to bring British and Afghan troops into Seistan. I hope that the Persian Government's past experience in this matter will lead it to view with the utmost suspicion any suggestions which may emanate from the same source, and that it will bear in mind that the main object of the British Government is not to unjustly favour Persia or Afghanistan, but to promote permanent peaceful relations between these two countries with whose independence and prosperity as neighbours of its Indian Empire its own interests in Asia are closely identified.

I have, &c.
(Signed) ARTHUR H. HARDINGE.

Inclosure 3 in No. 51.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

Meshed, September 9 (?), 1905.

MR. GRANT DUFF has just informed me by telegraph that the Persian Government have decided to reject Colonel MacMahon's Water Award, and therefore, I presume, intend to lodge a formal appeal against it with His Britannic Majesty's Government.

This news has occasioned me considerable surprise as in all my conversations with your Excellency on the subject of the Water Award you never indicated to me that any serious objection was felt by your Government to any of its provisions. The only point on which you offered some criticism was that of the division of the water, of which you seemed to think that the share of Persia should be equal to that of Afghanistan. I, however, pointed out to your Excellency that it would not be possible to induce the Afghan Government to accept such a division, inasmuch as the proportion of territory belonging to Afghanistan which depended for its irrigation on the Helmund, even north of Bund-i-Kemal Khan was very largely in excess of that belonging to Persia, whilst the obligation imposed on the Afghans to assure to the Persians the use of a third of the total volume of the Helmund below Bund-i-Kemal Khan in Afghanistan fulfilled the object which the Persian Government had in view in demanding that Colonel MacMahon should settle the water as well as the frontier questions, namely, to make certain that Persian Seistan should never be deprived by the Afghans of the water supply necessary to its irrigation.

I am not in a position to say what view will be taken by His Majesty's Government of the decision communicated by your Excellency to Mr. Grant Duff, and the remarks which I shall have the honour to submit to you below must therefore be regarded as personal to myself, and as solely inspired by that desire to promote feelings of friendship and confidence between our two Governments, which I share in common with your Excellency.

Looking at the matter from this standpoint, I greatly regret that before deciding to reject the Award the Persian Government did not instruct you to discuss with me, or with Mr. Grant Duff in my absence, in a friendly spirit, these points in it to which it took objection. I cannot but feel that this procedure is one which we had a right to expect, in view of the trouble and expense incurred by us in connection with this Award, and that it would have been more considerate and more courteous of the Persian Government to have confided to us, before taking such a step as the formal rejection of our Commissioner's arbitral decision, the grounds of its own dissatisfaction with it. It might have been possible for His Britannic Majesty's Legation to remove the misapprehensions, which, I am convinced, have influenced the decision of the Persian Government, and to have answered the objections which the Yamin-i-Nizam has deemed it his duty to make to certain features of the Award.

This was the course adopted by the Amier of Afghanistan. He did not reject the Award, but merely demanded explanations of some of its provisions, which he regarded as detrimental to Afghan interests. It will, I fear, seem strange to the British Government that a highly civilized Government such as that of His Majesty the Shah, versed in all the niceties of modern diplomatic intercourse, should have shown in such a matter less consideration for a friendly Power than a Ruler who, in Persia at any rate, is not considered as highly civilized, and has certainly not the same experience as the Ministers of the Shah in the conduct of international relations.

The ground on which, according to Mr. Grant Duff, the Persian Government has rejected the Award, is that the population of Persian Seistan do not consider it satisfactory.

Without inquiring as to how the views of this population have been ascertained, I may remind your Excellency that no arbitral decision of questions in dispute between two parties is likely, if absolutely just, to give satisfaction to either. Each will always consider that it has not received the full measure of advantage which it was entitled to expect.

The object of the Award, however, was not so much to give complete satisfaction to the Afghan or Persian cultivators of Seistan as to provide a settlement which should commend itself as fair to the wisdom of both Governments, and which should secure them against the danger of fresh conflicts such as those which have occurred in the past and have necessitated, in accordance with our Treaty, the intervention of the British Government.

It may well be that the population of Persian Seistan, looking only from a local point of view upon the question at issue between them and their Afghan neighbours, may be as greatly dissatisfied with Colonel MacMahon's decision as were the population of Tokiô with the compromise which has terminated the Russo-Japanese war. But we have a right to expect that His Majesty the Shah and his enlightened Advisers will take a broader view of these questions than the local cultivators directly affected by them, and will realize that the main object of Colonel MacMahon's Mission was to give reasonable satisfaction to both parties, to insure that both Persia and Afghanistan should have sufficient water for their practical requirements, and to guard against the danger that the Afghans, as the owners of the upper river, should take advantage of their position in order to divert for their own use water necessary to the requirements of their Persian neighbours.

I would therefore earnestly urge upon your Excellency the expediency of a reconsideration by the Persian Government of the decision notified by it to Mr. Grant Duff. I cannot but fear that if this decision becomes known in Seistan, the Afghan Government may, on its side, also determine to reject the Award as too favourable to Persia, that fresh encroachments may, in consequence, take place on either side, resulting in fresh and regrettable conflicts, and that a new and costly intervention may be imposed on the Government of India, whose Representative has already spent nearly two years in laboriously elaborating an equitable settlement of these questions.

I would therefore suggest to your Excellency that the Persian Government should, in order to prevent this danger, provisionally accept the Award, and order it to be put into at least provisional execution, reserving its rights to discuss with His Majesty's Legation those points in it to which the Yamin-i-Nizam and the Seistan authorities have taken exception; and if the result of this discussion fails to satisfy it, then appeal against it to His Majesty's Secretary of State.

In any case, I would strongly recommend that the objections of the Persian Government should be formulated with the least possible delay so as to terminate as quickly as may be the period of uncertainty and suspense which must necessarily result on the frontier itself from its decision, either wholly or partially, to reject the Water Settlement.

I would again remind your Excellency that this settlement was demanded by Persia alone. The Afghans, as owners of the upper reaches of the river, had no interest in tying their own hands and in limiting their irrigation rights; nor did His Majesty's Government originally propose to oblige them to do so. But the Persian Government, having insisted as a condition of its accepting the frontier laid down by Colonel MacMahon that the water question should be simultaneously settled, and the Afghans having accepted this proposal, it is now too late to go back upon it. To do so would, in fact, reopen the whole question, and might bring us back to the position in which we stood when, in the summer of 1902, the Atabeg-i-Azam, during the Shah's visit to London, appealed to Lord Lansdowne to protect, in accordance with Treaty, Persia's rights on the Helmund against the aggression of the Afghans, with this difference—that the Persian Government would appear to be placing itself in the wrong by quarrelling with those very good offices which it had been itself the first to invoke.

I would repeat that the above observations have not been offered by me under instructions from His Majesty's Government, and that I would wish your Excellency to regard them as merely the expression of my own feelings, and to submit them, in that character alone to the Sadr-i-Azam and to His Majesty the Shah.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) ARTHUR H. HARDINGE.

No. 52.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 217.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 10, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 128 of the 9th instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of a note from the Persian Government on the subject of the entry of Turkish troops into Vazneh, a district of Soujboulak.

The Persian Government ask that telegraphic instructions may be sent to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople to assist the Persian Ambassador in settling the difficulty with the Turkish Government.

I may mention that the language of the inclosed note is a mixture of Persian and Turkish, and the meaning is so badly and vaguely expressed that it is impossible to translate some passages into intelligible English. The second and third paragraphs, indeed, appear to me to be nonsense, and I shall endeavour to find out from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh what meaning his Excellency intended to convey.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 52.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 7, 1905.

LAHIJAN is a district in Soujboulak—Mukri, and Vazneh, its dependency, has been in the possession of the Persian Government for many years. The Persian tribes and frontier inhabitants have exercised and are exercising rights of possession there in living and grazing over this district. As the district is inhabited by our tribes, the local authorities are obliged to concentrate troops every year in the district for the purpose of collecting taxes and maintaining order. The district being on the frontier, and next to the border in possession of Turkey, whenever any force has been dispatched there the Turkish authorities have been in the habit of asking questions, and we have replied that it is for the purpose of maintaining order in the interior, and when the object is achieved the force will be withdrawn. The same question was asked last year and this year, and the same reply was given.

As most of the inhabitants of the district belong to the Piran tribe and crossed the frontier whenever they committed any crime, the Turkish officials created some doubt (*sic*) and in order to weaken the possession of Persia over the district, they reported to the Turkish authorities that the district in question is in *statu quo*, and they based their remonstrances on the very doubt created by themselves.

Last year seventy Turkish soldiers, under Abdur Rahman Effendi Minbashi, encroached on the land in question, but on representations being made they were withdrawn. Afterwards, the Foreign Office received a note from the Turkish Embassy saying that the Commissioners of the four Governments had decided on their tour that the land in question must be in *statu quo* and should not be taken possession of. We replied that even if it is to be in *statu quo* the district has from ancient times been in possession of Persians, who have improved the land and built upon it as owners, and it must continue to be so.

During the last few days reports have reached the Persian Government that Abdur Rahman Effendi Minbashi, at the head of some troops, intends to encroach on the land of Lahijan and Vazneh, and that he has written to the Chief of the tribes saying that as the winter is approaching the Turkish troops cannot live in tents, and asking him to prepare quarters for them. This very statement of Abdur Rahman Effendi is a sufficient proof that the district in question has for many years been in the possession of the Persians, who could not have built on the land had it not been in their possession.

According to the reports received from the Azerbaijan authorities, the Chief of the tribes and Haji Nejeif Kuli Khan have written to the Soujboulak authorities, saying that on the 5th instant the Turkish troops entered the house of Mohamed Agha, of Piran, in the old land of Lahijan and Shaisabad, and pitched their tents in the inhabited places and now live in them.

Although we have communicated with the Porte and the Turkish Embassy on the subject of this encroachment on the part of the Turks, still, as your Government is Arbitrator in the disputes arising between Turkey and Persia, I have the honour to protest to the British Legation against this act, and to request you to bring the matter, by the quickest means, to the notice of the British Government, in order that the British Embassy at Constantinople may be instructed by telegraph to assist the Arfa-ed-Dowleh, the Persian Ambassador, in the measures he is taking in this matter.

No. 53.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 218.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 10, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 215 of the 9th instant, I transmit herewith a copy of a communication from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez, regarding the possibility of the troubles in the Caucasus spreading to Azerbaijan.

On the 30th ultimo Mr. Wratislaw informed me by telegraph that all was quiet at Tabreez, but that the situation at Ardebil was threatening.

As I have had no subsequent report from him, I gather that there are no further developments.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 53.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 42. Confidential.)

Sir,

Tabreez, September 16, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 57 of the 12th instant, I have the honour to report that, in view of the uneasiness noticeable amongst both Armenians and Mussulmans in Tabreez in consequence of the fighting at Shusha, I thought it wise to take the Governor-General's opinion as to whether I could leave for Sorij Boulak without fear of any disturbance occurring during my absence. After some reflection, Nizam-es-Sultaneh asked me how long I proposed to be away, and on my saying from ten days to a fortnight, he replied that he thought he could guarantee that the town should remain quiet for so long as that, but that he could not be answerable for what might happen afterwards.

As I could not be quite sure of returning within the time mentioned I thought I had better not leave Tabreez for the present.

I was much struck by the changed attitude of Nizam-es-Sultaneh, who was full of confidence in his ability to maintain order under somewhat similar circumstances in the early summer, when both Armenians and Mussulmans appeared far more excited than at present. He certainly gave me the impression that he anticipated trouble, but he did not explain his reasons for considering the situation more critical now than then.

He has sent strict orders to the Governors of Ardebil and Urmi to take every precaution against a disturbance of the peace, and is doing everything he can himself with the same object. Inflammatory telegrams from across the Russian frontier are suppressed, but postal communications are more difficult to deal with, and I learn that several telegrams in code have been received by Mussulmans in the Shusha district by their friends asking for rifles and cartridges to be sent them.

Thus far order has been maintained in the district, with the exception of an incident at Ardebil, which, however, had no serious consequences. Three days ago one of the Farrashes of the Governor, whose brother was killed at Baku, stabbed an Armenian to death in the street. The Armenians were seized with a panic, and took refuge in the house of the agent of the Russian Consulate-General; but they were pacified the next day, and reopened their shops. The murderer has been arrested.

I hear that during the fighting at Shusha a number of a Karadagh horsemen went across the frontier to the assistance of their fellow Mussulmans, and that the Russian Consul-General has, in consequence, addressed remonstrances to the Governor of Tabreez.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. C. WRATISLAW.

No. 54.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 219.)
My Lord,

Tehran, October 10, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 66 of the 19th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith copies of correspondence on the subject of the importation of arms and ammunition destined for the use of His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed.

I have as yet, in spite of repeated requests, received no written reply to my note to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh of the 21st ultimo, but his Excellency informed me verbally last Wednesday that the application which your Lordship instructed me to make could not be granted by the Persian Government. The reason for their refusal was again stated to be that negotiations were in progress for the removal of certain arms imported by the Russian Consul-General at Meshed.

In these circumstances I venture to think that it is unlikely that I shall be able to obtain the desired permission by mere diplomatic pressure.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 54.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

M. le Ministre,

Gulahak, July 28, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform your Excellency that I have been asked by the Government of India to obtain the consent of the Persian Government to the introduction of 100 Martini rifles and 20,000 rounds of ammunition as a reserve for the protection of His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed, and of twenty rifles for His Majesty's Consulate in Seistan.

In view of the recent disorders in Meshed, I think your Excellency will agree with me that precautions of this nature are fully justified, and I feel sure that your Excellency will recognize that it is impossible for His Majesty's Government to allow their Representatives in these places to be less well furnished with the necessary means of defence, should the necessity for using them unfortunately arise, than those of other nations. In this connection I would beg to remind your Excellency that the Russian Consulates in Meshed and Seistan are said to have large reserves of rifles and ammunition, and that, according to the "Transcaucasian Review," fifty rifles have just been sent from Askani to M. Serepanoff, the Manager of the Russian Bank at Kuchan.

I have therefore the honour to request that your Excellency will kindly issue the necessary orders for the introduction of these arms and ammunition, and inform me that this has been done, in order that I may arrange as soon as possible for their immediate dispatch to their destinations.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. HARDINGE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 54.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Gulahak, August 25, 1905.

I REQUEST you to be so good as to favour me at an early date with a written answer to Sir A. Hardinge's note of the 28th ultimo, asking for the consent of the Persian Government to the importation of 100 Martini rifles and 20,000 rounds of ammunition for the protection of His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed, and of twenty rifles for His Majesty's Consulate in Seistan.

In view of the absence in Europe of His Majesty the Shah, I should be glad if you would lay the matter before His Majesty by telegraph.

Your Excellency is no doubt aware that a considerable consignment of ammunition destined for the Russian Consul-General at Meshed was recently introduced into Persia, via Kuchan, apparently with the connivance of the Customs authorities at that place. In these circumstances, and in view of the recent serious disturbances at Meshed, I venture to impress upon your Excellency the desirability of obtaining the sanction of the Shah for the importation of the arms and ammunition at as early a date as possible.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 3 in No. 54.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

September 12, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Minister's note of the 20th July last, and yours of the 25th ultimo, requesting permission for the import of 120 Martini rifles and 20,000 cartridges for the British Consul-General at Meshed and the Consulate in Seistan.

As I have already informed you verbally, we are taking steps to get the Russians to remove the arms they have imported, and therefore we are unable to give permission for the import of the arms above mentioned.

Inclosure 4 in No. 54.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

Gulahak, September 21, 1905.

I INFORMED His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the substance of your note of the 12th instant, in which the Persian Government decline to permit the importation of certain arms and ammunition destined for His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed.

As your Excellency is aware, considerable excitement prevails among the inhabitants of Meshed, Tabreez, and generally in Northern Persia, owing to recent events in Baku, and, although I am confident that the Government of His Majesty the Shah are taking every possible precaution to prevent an attack on the Armenian or other Christian residents in this country, it is not impossible that in towns like Meshed, where religious feeling runs high, some untoward incident may take place and the local authorities may be unable to control the populace. In these circumstances, I am instructed by His Majesty's Government to request your Excellency to reconsider the decision communicated to me in your note of the 12th instant, and to insist on their right to import a sufficient quantity of arms to protect His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed, and such British subjects as may be resident in that town. I should be grateful if your Excellency would favour me with an early reply.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Mr. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 223.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 11, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the monthly summary of events in Persia, which have not been recorded in other despatches.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFE.

Inclosure in No. 55.

Monthly Summary of Events in Persia, October 1905.

Meshed.

MESHED is reported to be in a very disturbed condition, and, according to the latest news in the possession of the Legation, the risk of serious trouble there, though less acute than it recently was, cannot be considered as at an end.

The religious feeling between Moslems and Armenians is complicated by intrigues and counter-intrigues.

The Russians, through M. Somow, First Secretary of their Legation, are endeavouring to exact compensation for the damage done to Russian subjects in the riots of last Moharrem; the Governor-General retorts that the riots were the work of Russian Moslems. The Russian Consul-General thereupon informed his Excellency that, in the event of fresh disturbances, the Persian Government will be held responsible for the safety of Armenians. To this both the Governor-General and the Karguzar have replied that the danger is once more from Russian Moslems, and that they must hold the Russian Consul-General responsible for the good behaviour of his subjects.

M. Reschetow accordingly summoned the leading Russian Moslems and asked them to give an undertaking that they would not make a disturbance. This they refused to do on two separate occasions, though it is reported that they have since given a qualified assurance.

The Russians, balked in their attempt to divest themselves of responsibility, apparently tried more subtle methods. A report was spread that the British were at the bottom of the trouble, and were trying to stir up disturbances in order to create an embarrassing position for the Russians at Meshed. Then the Khabir-es-Saltanah was induced to telegraph to Tehran that the Persian Armenians were buying arms in order to attack the Moslems. As there are said to be only about fifteen Armenians in Meshed at present, this attempt to load off responsibility on to the Persian Government seems rather ingenious. The Persian contention that any disturbances which may arise will be entirely due to the foreign element, is seemingly borne out by the fact that the leading Persian Mullahs, prompted by the British Consulate-General, are publicly preaching against any interference with Armenians, while the Mutewalli Bashi, Governor of the Shrine, has declared that he will not allow his "Seyids" to take part in any anti-Armenian disturbance. On the other hand, it is whispered that the Governor-General (the Asaf-ed-Dowleh) might find it very convenient to have trouble at Meshed at the present moment. He is in bad odour with the Valiahd and fears dismissal on the Shah's return, but if a disturbance could be engineered at the critical moment he would have to be continued in office to suppress it, and might even acquire a stronger position in the process. He has, however, taken the precaution of patrolling the streets in the quarter of the town in which the majority of the Russian Moslems live.

The Karabaghi and Baku religious students, the chief disturbing elements, are said to have joined forces and to be holding secret meetings, while the whole Turkish section is placing itself under the leadership of an obscure Mullah named Bakir Karabaghi. This man, when approached by an Envoy from the British Consulate-General, at first assumed a very fiery attitude, threatening extermination, not only to Armenians, but to all the Christians in Meshed. He was apparently led to see the folly of such talk, and our Envoy, by pointing out that any such movement would inevitably and instantly lead to a Russian occupation of Meshed, succeeded in reducing him to a milder and more sensible frame of mind.

In the whole business there are apparently two distinct centres of disturbance: (1) The Russian Moslems or Turks, whose fanaticism has been roused by recent news from the Caucasus; and (2) the Persian Moslems, who are becoming more and more indignant at Russian pressure for compensation for the riots of last Moharrem.

The Russian Legation has telegraphed to their Consul-General at Meshed that the Russian Government has agreed to keep a force of Cossacks in readiness on the frontier, and that if he should telegraph for them in case of need, they will reach Meshed within two days. Meanwhile, the detachment of Cossacks, whose recent arrival created such a sensation, has been considerably reduced, fifteen of them leaving for Ashkabad on the 23rd August, and four more for Kerman on the 6th September.

2. M. Somow, whilst at Meshed, was instructed, by telegraph, to do his utmost to further Russian interests with regard to the Meshed-Seistan telegraph line, of which the Russian Minister of Telegraphs is anxious to secure full control. It is said that the Russian Consulate in Seistan has already arranged to send messages for the Karguzar and the Belgian Director of Customs through the Russian signallers, and that the Russians rarely pay for the telegrams which they send.

3. There is a rumour to the effect that the export of wool from Afghanistan to Khorassan is to be forbidden, and the trade diverted to Kandahar, and so to India.

4. The Russians have appointed a Consul to Sabzewar, on the Tehran-Meshed Road.

Arabistan.

1. The neighbourhood of Dizful is still in a very disturbed condition.
2. Messrs. Lynch's steamer "Shushan" continues to lie at her moorings unused.

Kerman.

The Russians have made an unsuccessful attempt to have the Rukn-ed-Dowleh (whose removal from the post of Governor-General was reported in last Summary) continued in office.

Bunder Abbas.

Lieutenant A. J. H. Grey is making a reconnaissance of the Bunder Abbas-Regan road with the cognizance of the Indian Intelligence Branch. He is accompanied by two surveyors, who pass as his servants.

Tabreez.

1. Order has, so far, been preserved at Tabreez between Moslems and Armenians, though massacres at Erivan and Ardebil created considerable excitement in the town.

2. A frontier question has arisen on the Perso-Turkish border. The Turks have demolished a custom-house near Kuhne Lahijan, west of Soujboulak, built by order of the Belgian Customs official at Urmi. The district is inhabited by Kurds of the Sunni persuasion, and the Persians believe that the Turks have designs upon it. The latter are said to have sent a considerable force to the frontier, and the Persian authorities talk of sending an army.

Resht.

In spite of the warning of the danger of such a proceeding addressed by Mr. Grant Duff to the Persian Government, large numbers of Persian refugees from Baku have been allowed to come to Bazeli and Resht. Additional troops have been drafted into both places to preserve order.

Ispahan.

1. The Armenians of Ispahan celebrated the restitution of the property of their Church in Russia by an entertainment, at which the Acting Russian Consul was present.

2. Mr. Preece has returned to Ispahan, and resumed charge of His Majesty's Consulate-General.

Shiraz.

1. The case of Agha Khan, the Jew claiming French nationality, who has been mentioned in recent Summaries, continues to give trouble. In spite of assurances that no action would be taken against this man pending the settlement of the question of his nationality, his house was invaded, and seals placed by the local authorities on his property. His Majesty's Consul, acting on instructions given by Mr. Grant Duff after consultation with the French Chargé d'Affaires, has removed the seals.

2. The condition of the roads in Fars is still very unsafe; robberies are frequent, and the road guards levy a regular system of blackmail. A convoy of mules for the Government of India was held up near Kazeran by the road guards, who demanded a toll on each animal. In consequence of representations by His Majesty's Consul at Shiraz, the Governor-General has now undertaken to replace the road guards by regular troops.

3. The levy of "rahdari" and other illegal taxes has at length been discontinued by order of the Central Government, with whom His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires has been obliged to adopt a very strong attitude on this subject.

Seistan.

1. In addition to friction over the water question Persian and Afghan relations on the frontier are strained owing to the levy of passport fees from Afghans by the Persians.

2. M. Owseenko, Russian Consul in Seistan, is to go in the same quality to Bunder Abbas. It is said that the establishment of a Russian Consulate at Bunder Abbas has for its object the development of a trade route between that place and Seistan, in opposition to the Nushki route.

3. Russian intrigues against the awards of the Seistan Frontier Commission still continue; false and misleading articles, inspired, if not actually written, by the Russian Consul in Seistan, have appeared in the Russian and Persian editions of the "Trans-caspian Review," the "Habl-ul-Matin," and the "Muzafferi," a native newspaper of Bushire. The Government of India, at Mr. Grant Duff's request, are warning the editor of the "Habl-ul-Matin," and the local authorities at Bushire have been requested to warn the editor of the offending paper there.

The Russians are sedulously spreading reports of an intended British invasion of Seistan, utilizing the retention of the quarters of the Mission at Kuhak as evidence of sinister intentions.

MATTERS dealt with in separate Despatches.

Matters dealt with.	No. and Date of Despatch.
International Sanitary Station in Persian Gulf	No. 41, Commercial, of September 18.
Bakhtiari Road	No. 211 of October 5.
M. Naus' position	No. 212 of October 5.
Urmi case and American interests in Azarbaijan ..	No. 214, Confidential, of October 8.
Moslems and Armenians	No. 215 of October 9 and No. 218 of October 10.
Seistan Water Award	No. 216, Confidential, of October 9.
Perso-Turkish frontier troubles	No. 217 of October 10.
Reserve of arms for Meshed Consulate-General ..	No. 219 of October 10.
Benjam dispute	No. 220 of October 10.
Embargoes	No. 44, Commercial, of October 10.

(Signed) G. JARDINE KIDSTON.

Monthly Summary.

Tehran.

The Mujtehed Seyed Abdullah is doing his best to renew the agitation of last spring against M. Naus.

On the 23rd September the Russian Minister and his whole staff proceeded to Sultaneabad (the country residence of the Valiahd), and invested his Imperial Highness with the Order of St. Andrew, recently conferred on him by the Emperor of Russia. The Colonel of the Cossack Brigade, his officers, and the band of the regiment attended.

The Valiahd has returned to Tehran from the country.

Dr. Schneider, the Shah's principal European physician, has been seriously ill at Baku. He is reported to be better.

The Atabeg-i-Azam was laid up at Resht with a severe attack of gout.

Great preparations are being made for the reception of the Shah next Saturday (the 7th October). The streets through which His Majesty will pass are decorated.

There are persistent rumours here that M. de Speyer, the Russian Minister, is shortly to be recalled.

No. 56.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 6.)

(No. 224.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 11, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 219 of the 10th instant, and my telegram of this day's date, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of a note from the Persian Government on the subject of the importation of arms and ammunition for the use of His Majesty's Consulate-General at Meshed.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh states that the Persian Government is trying to preserve order in the country, and especially to insure adequate protection for the officials of friendly Powers resident in Persia. His Excellency considers that the import of arms, as desired, would endanger the security of the Consulate-General, and would create public excitement. He offers provisionally to place troops at the disposal of the Consulate-General, should His Majesty's Legation so desire.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 56.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 10, 1905.

WITH regard to the permission asked for to import arms and ammunition for the British Consulate-General at Meshed, I informed you, in my note of September 1904 that I would put the matter before His Imperial Majesty the Shah. As I have already informed you verbally, His Majesty's commands are that the Persian Government has been, and is trying, to preserve order in the country, and especially to maintain peace for the officials of friendly Powers residing in Persia, and that the import of arms for the protection of the Consulate-General is detrimental to security, and would be the cause of public excitement, which can never be the wish of the British Legation. If you think that precautions should be taken, the Persian Government is prepared to supply provisionally the Meshed Consulate-General with sufficient troops, both infantry and cavalry, in order to give complete satisfaction to the British Legation.

No. 57.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 7.)

Sir, *India Office, November 4, 1905.*
IN reply to Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 25th ultimo, as to the status of Bahreinise in Persia, I am directed to state that Mr. Secretary Brodrick concurs in the instructions which the Marquess of Lansdowne proposes to address to Mr. Grant Duff on the subject.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

No. 58.

Memorandum communicated to the Persian Minister, November 7, 1905.

ON the 1st instant the Persian Minister inquired whether His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople had received instructions to assist the Persian Ambassador at Constantinople to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the Lahidjen boundary question.

On the 9th ultimo His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran reported the complaint made by the Persian Government with regard to the Turkish occupation of the Vazneh district of Soujboulak, and the matter was at once brought to the knowledge of Sir N. O'Connor.

Lord Lansdowne would suggest that the Persian Ambassador at Constantinople should be instructed to consult with his Excellency, laying the facts of the case before him.

Foreign Office, November 7, 1905.

No. 59.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, November 8, 1905.*
WITH reference to my letter of the 21st ultimo, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a telegram from His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran,* relative to the importation of arms into Meshed and Seistan for the protection of the Consulates and British subjects.

It will be observed that the Persian Government still object to the importation of the arms, and that Mr. Grant Duff considers that they can only be introduced into Persia by force.

Lord Lansdowne, as at present advised, is not disposed to recommend this course, which would tend rather to arouse than to allay excitement among the Mussulman population. In view of the recent reports from Mr. Grant Duff, pointing to a better state of feeling at Meshed and the cessation of the troubles at Baku, to which the recent outbreak of fanaticism might be ascribed, his Lordship would be inclined not to press the question at the present moment, but he would be glad to be favoured with Mr. Brodrick's views in the matter.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

* No. 44.

No. 60.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 81.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, November 10, 1905.

STATUS of Bahreinise in Persia.

With reference to Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 180 of the 21st August last, you should avoid any reference to Persian claims to the island, which His Majesty's Government cannot recognize, and you should endeavour to induce the Persian Government to permit the Resident at Bushire to exercise his good offices on their behalf.

No. 61.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 11.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 10th November, relative to the destruction of the Seistan Mission buildings at Kuhak.

India Office, November 11, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 61.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 10, 1905.

YOUR telegram of the 7th instant as to destruction of Seistan Mission buildings at Kuhak.

Action taken by Persian Government is, in our opinion, so insulting as to render local reparation in some form indispensable. As to the Seistan Water Award, it is largely to the interest of the Persian Government to accept it; and mere acceptance of it by Persia would not be an act of reparation. It is for consideration whether reparation might not take the form of linking up Robat-Nasratabad telegraph line.

(Repeated to Tehran.)

No. 62.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 12.)

(No. 146.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 12, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Kuhak buildings.

My telegram No. 139 of the 1st instant.

I have secured a written undertaking from the Persian Government to re-erect the buildings if required to do so, but I have received no apology for their destruction.

Several cases of incivility to Consuls have of late been brought to my notice, and on the King's birthday I, with the Legation staff in uniform, awaited in vain the Shah's Representative between the hours officially arranged for his reception. Repeated telephone messages were sent to him, but he never arrived. Two days have now passed and I have received no official explanation, though, of course, I asked for one.

No. 63.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 13.)

(No. 147.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 13, 1905.

KING'S birthday incident.

My immediately preceding telegram.

I have now received an apology from Persian Government.

There is a marked change in the manners of the Persian Government since I was here ten years ago, and it would be very good for them if, in spite of their apology, they were made to understand that we will not tolerate incivility to British officials.

(Repeated to India.)

No. 64.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 14.)

(No. 149.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 14, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

I have received a telegram from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez asking me what punishment His Majesty's Government will require to be inflicted on the men who assaulted Gough, if they are caught and found guilty.

It is a mere chance that Gough was not killed, for twenty shots were fired at him at close range. I hope, therefore, that an exemplary punishment will be required by your Lordship.

Within one year the following cases have also occurred:—

The outrage on Douglas, for which no satisfaction has yet been received, and the serious wounding of a sowar belonging to the Shiraz Consular guard.

No. 65.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 82.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, November 15, 1905.

IMPRISONMENT for life should be demanded as punishment for the assailants of Captain Gough. His Majesty's Government might agree perhaps to a reduction to twenty years, after sentence has been passed.

The above is in reply to your telegram No. 149 of yesterday.

No. 66.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 150.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, November 15, 1905.

THE Persian Minister told me to-day that he had been instructed to ask me whether there was any truth in the rumour that an understanding had been arrived at between Russia and Great Britain in regard to their Asiatic interests. This rumour had created serious apprehension in the mind of the Persian Government. I told the Moez-Saltaneh that the report was without foundation. It was, no doubt, the case that, now that the war had come to an end, a desire was manifesting itself in many quarters to bring about a better understanding between the two countries. These ideas had not, however, taken shape. If they should ever do so, the Persian Government might rest assured that we had no intention of in any way encroaching upon the integrity and independence of Persia. He might therefore, I said, inform the Persian Government that their apprehensions were groundless.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 67.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 16.)

(No. 150.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 16, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Bahreinis. Your Lordship's telegram No. 81.

During the last two years both Sir A. Hardinge and I have done our utmost in this matter in the sense of the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram above referred to.

The Shah obstinately declines to allow us to intervene on behalf of the Bahreinis, who, he maintains, are his subjects.

A settlement of this question is very desirable, for Bahreini claims are by no means uncommon in South Persia.

On my again raising the subject yesterday, the Mushir-ed-Dowleh informed me that it had been decided by the Persian Government to instruct their Minister in London to enter into direct communication with your Lordship on this question.

The Shah is quite unreasonable, and it is useless to pursue the matter any further here.

No. 68.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 83.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, November 16, 1905.

I WILL take an early opportunity of speaking to the Persian Minister on the subject of the Kubah buildings and the incivility shown on the King's Birthday, as reported in your telegrams Nos. 146 and 147 of the 12th and 13th November respectively.

I understand you have already received an apology for the latter incident. With regard to the buildings, however, we can hardly demand re-erection, which would be unnecessary, but we must insist on a public apology of a conspicuous nature for their demolition, and you should inform the Persian Government accordingly.

No. 69.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 17.)

(No. 151.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 17, 1905.

SEISTAN Water Award.

Following received from His Majesty's Consul in Seistan:

"A letter has been transmitted by the Afghan Governor to Cabul from the Yamin-i-Nizam. The letter states that as McMahon's Water Award has been refused by the Persian Government, it is therefore inoperative, and that Persia consequently reverts to the *status quo ante* laid down in the Goldsmid Award."

No. 70.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 153.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 18, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Your telegram No. 83 of the 16th instant.

Would it be considered sufficient reparation by His Majesty's Government if the leading officials in Seistan were to call upon His Majesty's Consul and offer their apologies?

The incident might also be utilized for trying to obtain the telegraph extension to Kuh-i-Malik Siah.

No. 71.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 154.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 18, 1905.

I AM informed by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that a Company composed of nine Persians and one foreigner is about to be formed for running a service of Renard motor trains between Tehran, Kum, and Kermanshah, and between Tehran and Meshed. The capital is to be about 45,000l. In reply to my question as to who the foreign shareholder was to be, Mushir-ed-Dowleh said that he had not yet been nominated, but I suspect it is the Russian financial agent.

No. 72.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 20.)

Sir,

India Office, November 18, 1905.

I AM directed to acknowledge Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 8th instant on the subject of the views expressed in the telegram from His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran, of the 5th instant, as to the importation of arms into Meshed and Seistan for the protection of the Consulates.

In reply I am to state that Mr. Secretary Brodrick concurs in the opinion of the Marquess of Lansdowne that, in view of the objections to introducing the arms by force, and of the more favourable reports received from Mr. Grant Duff as to the state of feeling at Meshed, it is not necessary to press the matter further at the present moment.

I am, &c.

(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

No. 73.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 20.)

(No. 155.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 20, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Owing to the tyranny and cruelty of the second son of the Shah, who has now gone to Europe to submit to an operation, the condition of Shiraz and Fars has for some months been steadily getting worse. The present Administrator of the province, the Vazir, is every bit as bad.

I am informed by His Majesty's Consul at Shiraz that serious riots which threaten to spread over the entire province have broken out, and that the leader of the agitation has begged him to intervene in order to obtain the redress of the popular grievances. In reply, I have told him to say that he cannot intervene, but that I am doing my best to induce the Persian Government to appoint another Governor and restore order.

Over and over again I have warned the Persian Government of what would inevitably happen, and have done my utmost unofficially to get the present Governor and his Vazir removed. The Shah, however, declines to do anything, thinking his son and the Vazir excellent Governors.

Caravans with British goods are constantly plundered, and I consider that the prevailing anarchy seriously endangers British interests.

I would suggest that we should threaten to send Indian cavalry to escort caravans carrying British goods from Bushire. The present Grand Vizier is quite convinced that His Majesty's Government will bear anything rather than have recourse to strong measures, and nothing short of a threat will produce the slightest effect upon him.

(Secret.)

Kawan-ul-Mulk, who is the most important landowner in the Province of Fars, has taken "bast" at the house of the Grand Vizier, and has hinted that he will take

refuge here in the last resort. It may be impossible to refuse him, but I shall do all I can to prevent his seeking asylum here.

I have been informed recently by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that he is entirely of my opinion, but that the courtiers now surrounding the Shah are too much for him.

No. 74.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 22.)

(No. 157.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 22, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

My telegram No. 155 of the 20th November.

During the riots at Shiraz repeated attacks have been made on the Jewish quarter, and at least one Jewish woman has been killed. Acting on the advice of His Majesty's Consul, a Jew, who is an Italian subject, collected all the Jewish women and children that he could into his house, in order to protect them from danger, and a guard of Indian Sowars was then placed over the house. I believe that, in order to prevent outrages, such action was absolutely necessary.

I was requested by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh to order the withdrawal of the Sowars, but, in view of the prevailing anarchy, I refused to do so.

The situation in Fars is intolerable, and I trust your Lordship will take steps to force the Persian Government to put an end to it.

I am informed by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that he has received orders from the Shah to complain to your Lordship of what I have done.

My only reply was that I had already reported the matter to your Lordship.

No. 75.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 23.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 22nd November, relative to Persian telegraphs.

India Office, November 22, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 75.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 22, 1905.

FOLLOWING telegram, dated the 18th instant, has been received from Consul at Seistan:—

"Repair of Kain-Seistan telegraph line is about to be commenced by Russians. I am informed that the Khabir-us-Saham has sent by post to the Russian Inspector at Shusp the sum of 410 tomans for working expenses, and that all the Persian Ghilzans will co-operate."

Please refer to the despatch of the 8th September last, No. 191, from His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran to Foreign Office.

No. 76.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 23.)

(No. 158.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 23, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

An attempt has lately been made by the Grand Vizier to borrow a sum of 10,000*l.*, for his private use, from the Imperial Bank of Persia.

The Directors replied that the large outstanding debt owing to the bank by the Persian Government must first be repaid.

In the opinion of Mr. Rabino the financial situation here at present is worse than ever it was.

No. 77.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 24.)

Sir,

India Office, November 23, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence ending with the telegram of the 18th instant from His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran, as to reparation for the action of the local Persian officials in burning down the Seistan Commission buildings at Kuhak, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to invite the attention of the Marquess of Lansdowne to the telegram from the Viceroy of the 10th instant on the subject.*

Mr. Brodrick would leave it to Lord Lansdowne to decide whether, in the circumstances, it would be expedient to address, as proposed by the Government of India, a demand to the Persian Government for the construction of the Robat-Nasratabad telegraph line, by way of reparation for the outrage at Kuhak.

I am, &c.

(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 78.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 24.)

(No. 159.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 24, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

In continuation of my telegram No. 157.

Grand Vizier last night admitted to our Oriental Secretary that Fars was in a deplorable condition, but said that, in view of the Shah's attitude, he could not admit this officially.

No. 79.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 160.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, November 24, 1905.

THE Persian Minister informed me to-day that he had received from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh a telegram to the following effect:—

There had been a public demonstration in Shiraz against the Jews, and the Persian Government had been and were taking steps to restore order and security, and these would soon be restored. During the disturbances several Jews had been interfered with, and preventative measures were taken, in the course of which several Mussulmans were shot at, and a Jewess was accidentally wounded. The British Consul had made this a reason for sending all the Jews into the house of M. Venziani, an Italian subject, who is at the head of the Jewish school in Shiraz, and had placed

* Copy sent to Foreign Office, November 11, 1905.

the Indian cavalry of the Consulate guard round M. Venziani's house for their protection, notwithstanding the fact that all these Jews were Persian subjects, and that M. Venziani was an Italian subject, in bad repute throughout Fars for his misdeeds. His Majesty's Legation at Tehran had written a similar account of matters to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and a reply had been returned, stating that the Persian Government had been and were doing their utmost to restore order, and had specially appointed guards for the Jews. The Legation was earnestly requested to give instructions that the Indian cavalry should be immediately withdrawn from around M. Venziani's house, and was informed that, if this were not done, the responsibility for anything unpleasant that might occur would rest with the Consul, who had, without sufficient reason, exceeded his functions in collecting the Jews in M. Venziani's house, and in posting cavalry round them.

The Ala-es-Sultaneh was directed to draw my attention to the matter at once, and to say that these Jews were all Persian subjects, and that the Persian Government were doing everything for their security and protection. He was to inquire why His Majesty's Consul had thus exceeded his functions to the detriment of order and tranquillity in Shiraz, and to urge that telegraphic orders should be sent for the withdrawal of the cavalry from round M. Venziani's house, as their presence there might cause mischief, the responsibility for which would rest with Mr. Grahame, who had taken this unnecessary step.

Such incidents had happened and were happening in all parts of the world. Indeed, at the present moment, in Russia not a day passed without thousands of Jews being killed, and no steps had been taken by the British or other Governments. In Shiraz, where only a trifling incident had occurred, and where strong measures had been and were being adopted by the Government to maintain order and to protect the Jews, the British Consul had taken this unwarrantable step. Surely the British Government did not approve of Mr. Grahame's unfriendly action.

In reply to similar representations at Tehran you had stated that Mr. Grahame had acted rightly, and would not be instructed to withdraw the cavalry; further, that if tranquillity were not shortly restored His Majesty's Government would be requested to send Indian cavalry from Bushire for his protection.

I informed the Ala-es-Sultaneh that the incident to which the telegram referred had already been reported to me, and that the action of the Consul, far from being unwarrantable, seemed to His Majesty's Government to have been justified by the facts. It was evident, from the reports which had been made to us, that something approaching to anarchy had prevailed in Shiraz and Fars. There had been attacks upon caravans carrying British goods, and it was admitted even by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that, in the course of the disorders, several persons had lost their lives. According to my information, a Jewess had been killed, and not wounded, and the Consul, desiring to protect the Jewish women and children from imminent danger, had caused them to be collected in one house, and placed in charge of a guard of Indian cavalry. His action had been approved, and he had acted properly in declining to withdraw the troops so long as the disorders continued.

I took the opportunity of informing the Ala-es-Sultaneh that the recent conduct of the Persian Government seemed to me to have been most regrettable in several cases, and I referred particularly to the demolition of the buildings at Kuhak and to the failure of the Persian officials to call at the British Legation upon the King's birthday.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 80.

Mr. Spring-Rice to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 27.)

(No. 658.)

My Lord,

St. Petersburg, November 14, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform your Lordship that the "Slovo," a paper usually well informed in Persian affairs, states in its issue of to-day that the railway to Julfa on the Persian frontier will be open to through traffic next year. It adds that "after this, railway construction in Persia itself will be taken in hand."

I understand, however, from the Persian Minister here, that nothing has yet been done with a view to altering or removing the existing prohibition of railway con-

[1598]

R

struction in Persia, and that the "Railway Agreement" between Persia and Russia has still five years to run. He spoke with much bitterness of this "unnecessary obstacle" to Persian progress, and expressed the hope that one of the first results of a good understanding between England and Russia would be the removal of the present prohibition on railway construction.

I observed to him that I understood this "prohibition" was qualified by the condition that "no railways were to be constructed without Russia's consent," and that this consent would no doubt be granted when the moment came that Russia was ready.

From a good source I have lately been informed that the minor officials in the Department of the Ministry of Ways of Communication, which is concerned with the construction of new railways, have received notice that they will shortly be disbanded on account of the impossibility, for the time at any rate, of obtaining money for new railway construction.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CECIL SPRING-RICE.

(Copy of the above despatch has been forwarded unofficially by messenger to Tehran.)

No. 81.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 27.)

(No. 160.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 27, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

Yesterday a mob of students and Seyids, instigated by Mollahs, destroyed a branch of the Russian Bank which was being built here, on the plea that a Mahomedan cemetery had formerly existed on the site.

A Russian engineer had a narrow escape for his life. It is said that this is a prelude to disturbances of a serious nature, which are being organized against the Grand Vizier by the clergy.

No. 82.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 28.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy relative to the Ameer of Afghanistan and the Seistan Water Award.

India Office, November 28, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 82.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 27, 1905.

SEISTAN affairs are referred to by Ameer in his letter of the 2nd November, complaining of Russian proceedings on Afghan frontier as reported in my telegram of to-day's date. Ameer forwards a letter addressed to Afghan Brigadier commanding at Farrah by Yamin-i-Nazim to the effect that McMahon's Water Award is inoperative, since Persia has refused to accept it; and that Persia adheres to the *status quo ante* and the Goldsmid Award. Ameer inquires what action His Majesty's Government propose to take in view of Persian attitude, which he says is due to instigation of Russians.

Can you give me any information as to result of the representation which, as indicated in Grant Duff's telegram of the 13th ultimo, Persian Minister in London was to make to Lord Lansdowne, and also as to whether Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will give final decision in favour of Award in the event of Shah's present attitude being maintained? I should be glad to receive information on these points before question of reply to be made to Ameer is considered by Government of India.

(Repeated to Tehran.)

No. 83.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 29.)

(No. 161.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 29, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

(Secret.)

In a confidential interview with Abbas Kuli Khan, Oriental Secretary of the Legation, Mushir-ed-Dowleh stated that he considered the fall of the Grand Vizier imminent, and thought that his predecessor might be recalled.

The general situation, in his Excellency's opinion, is very bad indeed.

No. 84.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Grant Duff.

(No. 88.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, November 29, 1905.

YOU may accept an apology for the demolition of the Kuhak buildings in the form suggested in your telegram No. 153 of the 18th instant, but such reparation appears to be inadequate. You might, at the same time, demand that the buildings should be re-created.

If, on other questions such as the Kuli-i-Malik-Sia Telegraph extension, the Persian Government show a conciliatory disposition, the demand for re-erection need not be pressed.

While the extension should be treated as a set-off to the Godan line rather than as compensation for the incident at Kuliak, you should explain to the Persian Government that the worst impression is created here by their continued refusal to grant the extension, combined with such incidents as that at Kuliak and other proceedings of the Yamin in Seistan. The best means of effacing this bad impression would be for the Persian Government to spontaneously offer to construct the extension before you are again instructed to demand it.

No. 85.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Grant Duff.

(No. 89.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, November 29, 1905.

YOU should point out to the Grand Vizier, with reference to your telegram No. 155 of the 20th instant on the subject of the condition of Shiraz and Fars, that the Persian Government appear to be gradually losing their hold on Southern Persia to the great injury of British commercial interests, that the Bunder Abbas route is notoriously insecure, and that the Fars route will soon be as unsafe as the Arabistan route.

You should say that we shall be obliged, if the present state of affairs is allowed to continue, to take such measures as we may consider necessary to protect our interests, and the proposal to send cavalry to escort the caravans may be hinted at.

Details of robberies which have occurred should be reported, and you should ascertain whether the caravans were Persian, carrying British and other foreign goods, or whether they belonged to British or Indian firms. In the latter case demands for compensation should be made to the local authorities.

No. 86.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received November 30.)

Sir,

India Office, November 30, 1905.

I AM directed to return herewith the draft of the telegram which the Marquess of Lansdowne proposes to send to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran in reply to his telegram No. 151 of the 17th November, on the subject of the Seistan Water Award, and to say that Mr. Secretary Brodrick concurs in the terms of the draft.

I am also directed to inclose, to be submitted for Lord Lansdowne's consideration, the draft of a telegram which Mr. Brodrick proposes to send to the Viceroy in reply to his Excellency's telegram of the 27th November, reporting the substance of a communication received from the Ameer as to the letter from the Yamin-i-Nazim to the Afghan Brigadier commanding at Farrah, stating that, Persia having refused to accept the Seistan Water Award, the Award is inoperative.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 86.

Draft of Telegram from Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Secret.)

YOUR telegram of 27th instant: Ameer's representation as to Seistan Water Award.

Grant Duff has been instructed, in reply to his telegram of the 17th November, to inquire of Persian Government whether Yamin was acting under their orders in making his communication to Afghans, and, if not, to request that he may be instructed to withdraw it. Grant Duff will also inform Persian Government that as they asked for arbitration, they cannot revert to *status quo*, but that, if, after discussion with Grant Duff, they are still dissatisfied, they must appeal against Award to His Majesty's Government, whose decision they have agreed to accept, provided it be in accordance with the Goldsmid Award. (See Erskine's despatch No. 156 of the 10th November, 1902.) Grant Duff will make it clear to Persian Government that while, if they appeal against Award, His Majesty's Government are prepared to consider fully Persian representations before giving their decision, they cannot allow Persian Government, as one of Parties to arbitration, to notify to other Party intention of disregarding Award. Finally, Grant Duff will intimate that unless Persian Government submit appeal within reasonable period, His Majesty's Government will consider Award as final, and take effective measures to render it operative.

I would suggest that Ameer might be informed of line of action adopted towards Persian Government by His Majesty's Government, who, if Persians appeal against Award, will give their decision on merits without regard to any considerations but those of interests of Afghanistan and Persia, and of equitable adjustment of their differences.

No. 87.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received November 30.)

(No. 162.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 30, 1905.

I HAVE received a telegram from Vice-Consul at Yezd, of which following is the substance:—

"Recently a boy was dismissed from the mission school for circulating indecent poetry. He complained to the Mullahs, and a leading Mujtehed is now preaching in the mosque against Christians, threatening lives of teachers, inciting people to beat pupils to death, also servants of Europeans. He states that he will answer to the

Shah for anything they may do. Governor, who is absent, has been informed and ample time given, but nothing done. Chief Mujteheds remain passive. School closed pending reply. Matter extremely urgent. Copy wired Consul-General, Ispahan."

Mushir-ed-Dowleh, to whom I at once made representations, assures me that he has taken all steps necessary for protecting Christians. I have again written to his Excellency to-day to keep him up to the mark.
I have no further news from Yezd.

No. 88.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 1.)

(No. 164.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 1, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India.

Grand Vizier, whom I saw on Wednesday, stated that he required a loan of £800,000—i.e., a sum exceeding by £500,000 the amount owed already by the Persian Government to the Imperial Bank of Persia, and which the Persian Government are unable to pay.

His plea, as on former occasions, is that he wishes to reorganize the administration and the army, and that without money this is impossible. He proposes that interest should be at the same rate as in the case of the last loan, and that the present loan should be repaid in thirty years by instalments. As security he offers the Customs of Fars, the Bank Royalty, the Posts and Telegraph, and the Fisheries of Ghilan.

I am informed by the Manager of the Bank that their accounts must be signed by the Auditors on the 5th instant, and that the Persian Government must repay £150,000 by that date, though this sum might be reduced to £100,000 by agreement with the Directors.

The Grand Vizier says that the Russian Government are prepared to lend him about £1,500,000, but on conditions which he is, so far, not prepared to accept. If, however, His Majesty's Government will not grant him the loan for which he now asks he will be forced to have recourse to the Russian Government. He declined to state their conditions.

I promised to lay the matter before your Lordship, but gave him no hope that His Majesty's Government would entertain the idea of advancing so large an amount.

The Fisheries and Posts and Telegraphs have already been pledged, and are therefore unavailable as security, while any scheme of reform is hopeless under the present Shah.

A large sum would be at once swallowed up for payment of the officials and troops, who all over Persia have received no pay for nearly a year.

No. 89.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 91.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, December 1, 1905.

YOU should inquire of the Persian Government whether, in making the communication to the Afghans on the subject of the Seistan Water Award, as reported in your telegram No. 151 of the 17th ultimo, the Yamin was acting under instructions. If this was not the case you should request them to instruct him to withdraw it. At the same time they should be informed that the proper course for them to adopt is to represent their objections to the Award to you, and if, after discussion, they are still of opinion that the Award is injurious to their interests, they should appeal against it to His Majesty's Government. As they asked for Arbitration on this question they cannot revert to the *status quo* simply because they are dissatisfied

with the decision. While we are willing to review the Award and to listen to any representations which they may have to make, it should be clearly pointed out to them that they cannot be allowed, as one of the parties to the arbitration, to notify to the other party their intention of disregarding the Award. Their appeal should, therefore, be submitted within a reasonable period, and unless this is done we shall consider the Award as final, and effective measures will be taken to carry it out.

No. 90.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 2.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 1st December, relative to the Persian telegraphs.

India Office, December 2, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 90.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

December 1, 1905.

TELEGRAPHS in Persian.

Meshed Consul-General telegraphs on the 25th ultimo to the effect that it is reported that arrangements for posting a Russian telegraph official at Subsawar are being made by the Russian Minister.

Consul-General's telegram repeated to Tehran.

No. 91.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 2.)

(No. 166.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 2, 1905.

In continuation of my telegram No. 162 of the 30th ultimo.

I am informed by Vice-Consul at Yezd that all is now quiet in that town. He understands that for the present the preaching is discontinued. He was assured by the Governor that the boy had only been released after sureties had been taken for his good behaviour and that he was punished, but from a trustworthy source the Vice-Consul learns that it was pressure from the Mullahs which brought about his release, and that no punishment was inflicted.

The Vazir of Yezd has promised to visit the school in person, to issue a notice warning the people not to interfere with it, and to obtain a written undertaking from the Mullah who preached to keep quiet.

In the Vice-Consul's opinion the Governor is powerless, and afraid to take adequate measures, and he recommends the quiet removal to Tehran of the Mullah who caused the disturbance.

I doubt whether the Mushir-ed-Dowleh has power to effect his removal, even if he is willing to issue the necessary orders, but I am addressing him in the sense desired by the Vice-Consul.

No. 92.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 2, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, relative to the Seistan Water Award, and to inform you that his Lordship concurs in the terms of the telegram which the Secretary of State for India proposes to send to the Viceroy on this subject.

I am, &c.

(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 93.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 6.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 4th December, relative to the Seistan Water Award.

India Office, December 5, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 93.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, December 4, 1905.

SEISTAN Water Award. Your telegram of the 27th November regarding Ameer's representations.

Following is substance of instructions sent to Grant Duff in reply to his telegram of the 17th ultimo:—

He is to inquire whether it was under the orders of the Persian Government that Yamin made the communication to the Afghans, and, if not, he is to request Persian Government to send Yamin orders to withdraw it. He is further to inform Persian Government that they cannot revert to the *status quo ante*, as they asked for arbitration, but that if, after discussion with Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran, they are still dissatisfied with Award, they must submit appeal against it to His Majesty's Government, whose decision in the matter, provided it be in accordance with Goldsmid Award, Persia has agreed to accept (*vide* Erskine's despatch No. 156 of the 10th November, 1902). It is to be made clear to Persian Government that, as one of the parties to arbitration, they cannot be allowed to notify to the other party that they intend to disregard Award, although, in the event of their appealing against it, His Majesty's Government are prepared, before giving decision, to consider fully any representations Persian Government may make. Finally, Grant Duff will intimate that His Majesty's Government will consider McMahon's Award as final, and will take effective measures to render it operative, unless, within reasonable period, an appeal against Award is lodged by Persian Government.

I would suggest that Ameer might be informed by your Excellency of the line of action adopted towards the Persian Government by His Majesty's Government, whose decision, if Persians submit an appeal, will be given on merits of the case, without regard to any considerations other than those of equitable adjustment of differences between Persia and Afghanistan, and of equitable settlement in the interests of both countries.

No. 94.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 6.)

(No. 168.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 6, 1905.

I HAVE received to-day the following telegram from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Yezd:—

"Situation apparently normal. School reopens 7th December."

No. 95.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 170.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 7, 1905.

THE Persian Minister called upon me yesterday, and read to me the telegrams of which copies are attached to this despatch.* The Ala-es-Sultaneh assured me most earnestly that the failure of the Representative of the Persian Government to call at the British Legation in the usual manner on the King's birthday was due solely to an accident, and that nothing was further from the thoughts of the Shah and his Ministers than to show the slightest disrespect to the Sovereign of this country. With regard to the demolition of the huts at Kuhak, the Ala-es-Sultaneh dwelt upon the fact that they had been originally erected by the Persian Government itself, and that the local authorities had been distinctly told that their demolition was desired by His Majesty's Government.

I saw the Ala-es-Sultaneh again to-day, and told him that after a careful consideration of the statements which he had laid before me, I was glad to find that the omission to call in the usual manner on the King's birthday was accidental, and that the Persian Government had had no intention of not conforming to established usage on that occasion. After the full explanation which he had communicated I considered the incident to be closed.

As regards the Kuhak incident, it afforded me satisfaction to learn that what had appeared a somewhat discourteous action was also due to a misunderstanding. I said that we were consequently prepared to waive our demand for the re-erection of the buildings, if the Persian Government would undertake that the local Governor should make an official call upon His Majesty's Consul in Seistan, and express regret that such a misunderstanding should have occurred.

The Ala-es-Sultaneh expressed himself much pleased with my proposal, which he accepted gratefully.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 96.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 93.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, December 8, 1905.

WITH reference to the demolition of the Kuhak buildings mentioned in my telegram No. 88 of the 29th ultimo, the Persian Minister has been to see me, and stated (I believe incorrectly) that the buildings had originally been erected by the Persian Government itself, and further that the local authorities had been told distinctly that His Majesty's Government desired their demolition.

I replied that it gave me pleasure to learn that what had appeared a somewhat discourteous proceeding was due to a misunderstanding, and I added that we were prepared in this instance to waive our demand for re-erection if the Persian Government would undertake that the local Governor should pay an official call on His Majesty's Consul in Seistan, and express regret that a misunderstanding had occurred.

* Not printed.

The Persian Minister also communicated a message from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh on the subject of the failure of the Shah's Representative to call at the Legation in the usual manner on the King's birthday. He assured me most earnestly that the incident was purely accidental, and that nothing was further from the thoughts of the Shah and of his Government than to show the slightest disrespect to His Majesty King Edward. I said that after this full explanation I considered the incident closed.

No. 97.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 9.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 8th December, relative to the Seistan Water Award.

India Office, December 8, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 97.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

December 8, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

SEISTAN. Please refer to my telegram of the 27th ultimo, regarding Water Award.

A telegram, dated the 30th November, has now been received from His Majesty's Consul to the effect that Afghans are complaining that more water is being taken by the Persians than they have ever taken before. Macpherson states that Afghan complaint is fully justified, as the Persians are receiving 1,400 cubic feet per second, while the Afghans are only getting 100, and no water was passing down the Sikhsar channel.

Two dams were recently constructed by Afghans, one across Helmund at Shahgul, and the other at the mouth of Lakshak canal. Effect of latter was to reduce by about one half the Lakshak supply. Gangs of Persians were collecting in anticipation of orders for removal of dam being issued by Yemen.

Macpherson fears that there will be serious trouble unless the Persians allow a larger amount of water to flow down the Helmund at Bund-i-Kobak. He is, however, trying to arrange to induce the Afghan Governor to settle matter amicably, should dispute arise.

No. 98.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 9.)

(No. 169.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 9, 1905.

THE following telegram has been sent to the Government of India:—

"I trust that if a loan is to be made to the Persian Government, the settlement of British claims here, some of which have been outstanding for ten years, will form one of the conditions."

No. 99.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 9.)

(No. 170.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 9, 1905.

I HAVE received the following telegram from His Majesty's Consul in Seistan on the 7th instant:—

"As the Persian Government have frequently assured us that we may claim for our telegraph officials all privileges accorded to the Russians, I beg to suggest

advisability of profiting by present opportunity afforded in connection with repair of line to claim a share in the work by demanding either that one of our signallers be appointed to assist Russian constructor in his work; or even better, that we should undertake the repair of the southern section of the line, while the Russian sphere of work be limited to that of the northern. We can easily spare Howson from Birjand for the purpose, if this be arranged. I am afraid that Russian control of the line will become absolute unless we assert our rights at the present juncture.

"This telegram is repeated to the Government of India.

(Signed) MACPHERSON."

I have sent the following telegram to the Government of India, and His Majesty's Consul in Seistan:—

"Captain Macpherson's telegram of the 7th instant.

"I do not think that Persian Government will be successful in their negotiations with Russian Government to obtain withdrawal of Russian signallers. I am of Captain Macpherson's opinion, that, unless we endeavour to assert our rights on the Seistan line, the Russians will gain complete control of it. Captain Macpherson's first proposal would probably lead to trouble, but division of line into sections to be repaired by British and Russians respectively might be arranged."

No. 100.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 11.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of the Secretary of State for India, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 10th instant, relative to disputes between the Persians and Afghans in the matter of the Seistan Water Award.

India Office, December 11, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 100.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

December 10, 1905.

I AM addressing Answer in the sense suggested in your telegram of the 4th instant regarding Seistan Water Award. Telegraphing on the 2nd instant, Macpherson reports that on the 29th ultimo the dam at Lakshak was totally demolished by the Persians. Yamen, to whom Afghan Governor has written about destruction of the dam, intended to meet latter to discuss matters in a few days' time. Macpherson adds that the patience of the Afghans cannot be expected to continue indefinitely.

No. 101.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 11.)

(No. 172.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 11, 1905.

THE following telegram has been sent to the Government of India:—

"My despatches Nos. 239 and 263 of the 5th November and the 7th December. Majid-es-Sultani has received permission for departure from the Shah."

No. 102.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 13.)

(No. 173.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 13, 1905.

FOLLOWING telegram repeated to Government of India:—

"A serious riot took place here on the 13th December, owing to the Governor of the town causing certain shopkeepers to be beaten. The real cause of the movement is feeling against the Shah and Grand Vizier, and it may attain considerable dimensions."

No. 103.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 14.)

(No. 174.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 14, 1905.

FOLLOWING addressed to Government of India:—

"Post-offices in the Persian Gulf.

"Sir A. Hardinge handed in original to M. Naus Foreign Office despatch No. 85 of the 17th June, of which I presume you have received a copy. Minister of Customs informed me verbally, before leaving for Constantinople in October, that he in no way objected to conclusion of an arrangement on the lines suggested by Lord Lansdowne, but that he would communicate with me in writing on the subject.

"As I presume Lord Lansdowne's instructions refer to the parcels mails only, I do not propose to raise the question of a general Postal Convention. It is improbable that I shall receive the reply M. Naus has promised me until he returns, but I am endeavouring to obtain it as soon as possible."

No. 104.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 15.)

(No. 175.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 15, 1905.

I HAVE repeated the following telegram to Government of India and to His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire:—

"Despatch No. 42 to Foreign Office of the 31st March, 1868: Benjam.

"I have been verbally informed by Mushir-ed-Dowleh that the Concession makes no mention of land. Have we any document granting land which appears to have been held by us in 1880, when we abandoned the station?"

No. 105.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 227.)

My Lord,

Tehran, October 18, 1905.

WITH reference to Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 193 of the 6th September last, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch which I have received from His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez, reporting the resumption by the Russians of work on the Julfa-Tabreez road, on which it is proposed to institute a service of motor-cars when the work is completed.

I have, &c.

(Signed)

EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 105.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 45.)

Sir,

Tabreez, October 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 37 of the 21st August, I have the honour to report that work has been resumed with energy on the Deré Diz portion of the Russian road from Julfa to Tabreez. Strong stone barricades are being built to keep the water off, and the position of the road has been changed in certain parts, but the general opinion still is that a heavy flood would again destroy it.

The building of the new bridge over the Aji Tehai near Tabreez appears to be abandoned for the present, and alterations are being made in the existing Persian bridge so as to adapt it for the service of motor-cars, which is to be instituted when the road is ready.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. C. WRATISLAW.

No. 106.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 231.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 2, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to draw your Lordship's attention to the seriously disturbed condition of the country through which the Bakhtiari Road passes.

Since I have been in charge of His Majesty's Legation, and during Sir Arthur Hardinge's absence at Barfarsli and Meshed, I have repeatedly, both verbally and in writing, made representations to the Persian Government regarding the constant robberies of caravans, several of which were carrying goods belonging to Messrs. Lynch. The Grand Vizier and the Mushir-ed-Dowleh have over and over again promised to take steps to re-establish order in the districts in question, but the promised orders are either never sent or have hitherto been disregarded by the local authorities. The depredations to which I refer are usually committed by a tribe called the "Kuhgelu," who are nominally under the Government of Fars. The Bakhtiari, who under their concession are supposed to maintain order on the road, are compelled by the Persian Government to pay compensation for the losses entailed by the robberies, but at the same time are for some reason forbidden to pursue and punish the Kuhgelu robbers, who enjoy complete immunity.

I have in a separate despatch reported on the disorder and anarchy existing in Fars owing to the incapacity, cruelty, and tyranny of the Shm-es-Sultaneh, the second son of the Shah, who for the last year has been Governor-General of that province. His Royal Highness is mainly responsible for the acts of the Kuhgelu, and, in spite of the constant complaints which have been made to him, takes no trouble whatever to bring the perpetrators of these robberies to justice. The Mushir-ed-Dowleh informed me yesterday that, owing to the representations which I have made, the Shah has ordered a new Law to be issued making all Governors throughout Persia responsible for robberies committed in the districts under their orders. Hitherto when a robbery was committed in Kerman the Governor-General of that province said the thieves came from Fars, and the Governor of the latter of course maintained that the robbers were from Kerman. The result naturally has been that the unfortunate merchant or traveller fell between two stools, and often received no compensation, in spite of every effort on the part of the Representative of his Government to obtain satisfaction. The new Law, with a copy of which the Mushir-ed-Dowleh has promised to furnish me, will, if properly enforced, be a considerable safeguard to merchants; but, like every regulation issued in this unhappy country, it will, too probably, soon become a dead letter, and the highway robberies will continue as merrily as before.

In my opinion, the only way of securing real protection for our commerce on the Bakhtiari and other roads would be to institute road-guards under the command of British officers. From correspondence in the archives in His Majesty's Legation, it would appear that His Majesty's Government were two years ago not prepared to take such a step; but it must be remembered that this country is yearly becoming more disturbed and the Central Government less capable of maintaining order. If our present policy in regard to Persia is to be maintained, sooner or later some system of affording

protection to British commerce will have to be considered, or merchants will no longer risk their goods on such roads as that between Bushire and Shiraz, where the "tufangchis," or road-guards, are among the most impudent and pertinacious of the robbers.

I inclose a paraphrase of a telegram from His Majesty's Consul-General at Isfahan, who is now in the Bakhtiari country. This telegram gives a vivid idea of the prevailing insecurity.

I also transmit a copy of my note to the Grand Vizier, calling his attention to the state of affairs on the road in general and to the robbery reported by Mr. Preece. I have little hope that my representations will produce permanent, if, indeed, any, effect, and, having exhausted diplomatic means, I would venture to ask your Lordship's instructions as to what course I am to pursue should the Persian Government fail to restore order in the districts through which the Bakhtiari road passes.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 106.

Consul-General Preece to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 40.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Junagun, October 22, 1905.

ANOTHER caravan has been robbed by Kuhgelus near Pulamaret, and sixteen mules, four donkeys, and a quantity of merchandize stolen. The Bakhtiari Chiefs are very incensed by this further Kuhgelu robbery. Reynolds practically witnessed it, so that the Shua-es-Sultaneh cannot say that the story is a lie. Reynolds came up shortly after the event, and the muleteers told him the whole story on the spot.

The Chiefs say that they will have to close the road if this sort of thing is not put a stop to. They say that they will post notices at Ahwaz, Shuster, and Isfahan saying that the road is unsafe, and that they will not be responsible for the security of caravans. They threaten to close the road unless they are allowed by the Government to hunt down robbers in accordance with the terms of their concession, or else are paid back all the compensation which they have had to give. A third suggestion is that the Kuhgelus should be put under their rule.

The road has never been so much used as this year, and I am informed that at present there are 2,400 loads awaiting carriage at Ahwaz. Immense loss to our commerce and prestige would be caused by its being closed, even for a short time.

Please take such steps as you can, and as soon as possible, to remedy this state of things.

Inclosure 2 in No. 106.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Ain-ed-Dowleh.

Your Highness,

Tehran, October 26, 1905.

I HAVE to-day received a telegram from His Majesty's Consul-General at Isfahan, who is at present at Junagun, reporting that a further serious robbery by Kuhgelus has taken place at Pulamaret, sixteen mules, four donkeys, and a quantity of merchandize being carried off. The robbery was witnessed by an English engineer who was travelling on the road.

The Bakhtiari Chiefs are justly incensed at the state of things existing on the road. They are supposed to maintain order, and are prevented from doing so by the Persian Government. They now declare that if they are not permitted to follow up and arrest the robbers, whether Kuhgelus or others, in accordance with their concession, they will post notices in Isfahan, Shuster, and Ahwaz stating that the Bakhtiari road is unsafe, and that they will not be answerable for goods stolen.

I have made constant complaints to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh during the last few months in regard to the anarchy prevailing in those districts which are supposed to be governed by the Shua-es-Sultaneh. Mr. Preece reports that 2,400 loads are at Ahwaz waiting to be carried to Isfahan and elsewhere, and that, should the road be closed from want of security, for even a short time, great loss will ensue.

It must be clear to your Highness that this state of things cannot continue and may expose the Persian Government to a heavy claim for compensation.

[1598]

U

As my constant representations to the Persian Government appear to be entirely neglected, I am bringing the present state of the Bakhtiari road to the notice of His Majesty's Government, who will no doubt be surprised to learn how little attention is paid to the repeated requests I have made that order should be restored in the districts in question.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

No. 107.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 233.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 3, 1905.

ON receipt of the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram No. 73 of the 21st ultimo, I addressed to the Persian Government the note, copy of which I have the honour to inclose, on the subject of the importation of arms and ammunition destined for the use of His Majesty's Consulate-General at Meshed.

In spite of several verbal requests for a reply, I have as yet had no answer from the Persian Government.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 107.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Tehran, October 21, 1905.

I LOSE no time in bringing to the notice of His Majesty's Government the substance of your note of the 19th instant, in which you are so good as to furnish me with your reasons for declining to sanction the importation of certain arms and ammunition destined for the use of the British Consulate-General at Meshed.

I have the honour to inform you that I have to-day received telegraphic instructions from the Marquess of Lansdowne again to press strongly for permission to import the arms in question as a measure which His Majesty's Government consider necessary, in order that the British subjects composing His Majesty's Consulate-General at Meshed may protect themselves should the occasion to do so unfortunately arise.

I am to assure the Persian Government that, if they will agree to sanction the importation, every care will be taken to introduce the arms into the country without ostentation, and to keep them, on their arrival in Meshed, in such a way as to be concealed from public view.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

No. 108.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 236.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 4, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 217 of the 10th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith further correspondence on the subject of the frontier dispute at Vazneh.

The Turkish Ambassador yesterday sent one of his staff to inquire what steps I had taken in the matter, and I informed him in the sense of my telegram No. 128 of the 9th ultimo and your Lordship's reply.

I gather that the Turkish Ambassador considers the dispute serious. I strongly suspect that the matter has been arranged purposely in order to force the Persian Government to settle certain long outstanding claims.

On p. 218 of "Hertslet's Treaties" between Great Britain and Persia I observe that after the Anglo-Russian survey of the Turco-Persian boundary which terminated

in 1865 the two Mussulman Governments were left to settle the actual frontier. This has apparently never been done.

Zia Bey stated that the Turkish Embassy here had constantly but fruitlessly urged the Sublime Porte to delimit the frontier in conjunction with the Persian Government.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 108.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

Tehran, October 10, 1905.

ON receipt of your note of the 7th instant, in accordance with your wishes, I at once telegraphed to His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs regarding the entry of Turkish troops into Vazneh, a district of Soujboulak. I have the honour to inform your Excellency that Lord Lansdowne has to-day telegraphed to say that His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has been instructed to use his good offices in settling the question in dispute, should he think it desirable.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 2 in No. 108.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 12, 1905.

IN my note of the 7th instant I informed you and protested against the remonstrances and unexpected encroachments of the Turkish military authorities on Lahijan, in Soujboulak, of Mokri and Vazneh, in that district, which is a *bona fide* property of the Persian Government, and which has been in our possession for many years, and is inhabited by Persian tribes. I requested you in my note above mentioned to inform the proper authorities of this encroachment. In order to acquaint you with the facts of the further encroachments on the part of the Turkish authorities, I have the honour to state that, according to the last reports, on Sunday, the 8th instant, 200 men, mounted on mules, have joined at Vazneh the Zoori tribe, which had crossed the frontier before them and occupied the place. It also appears that Mir-Alaz, with some infantry and guns, together with the Pushderi tribe residing in Turkish territory, is to join the others at Vazneh on the 9th instant. It is stated that they intend to encroach as far as Lahijan, taking possession of Bar-Mirakar on their way, and to join at the former place Abdur Rahman Minbashi, whose encroachment has already been brought to your notice in my note above mentioned.

Under these circumstances I renew my previous protest, and have the honour to request you to be good enough to bring these facts to the notice of the British Government, in order that they may instruct the British Ambassador at Constantinople to assist the Persian Representative, the Arfa-ed-Dowleh, in the measures he is taking in the matter.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) MUSHIR-ED-DOWLEH.

Inclosure 3 in No. 108.

Consul-General Wratistaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 46.)

Sir,

Tahreez, October 10, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to confirm my telegram No. 65 of the 7th instant, reporting a difficulty which has arisen on the Soujboulak frontier between Turkey and Persia.

The exact situation of the custom-house which M. Leloux, the Belgian Customs Inspector, with head-quarters at Urmi, caused to be built near Kuhue Lahijan, is rather doubtful; but the village itself, which the Turks are now reported to have occupied, is marked (on the only map where I can find the name) several miles, on the Persian side of the frontier. It has always been subject to Persian authority, though

the frontier has never been properly delimited. Another Persian village named Vazieh is also reported to be now in Turkish hands. I cannot locate the place, though on the same map a district of this name is marked, again within the Persian frontier.

The Kurds of Soujboulak district, who number, including the population of the town, about 230,000 souls, do not live by plunder like too many of their race, but are engaged in agriculture and kindred pursuits, and are comparatively well-to-do. They are all Sunnis, and have shown aspirations after autonomy. A movement in this direction was started some nineteen years ago by one of themselves, who was then Governor under the Shah, but he, by some sad mistake, swallowed a dose of poison prepared by one of his wives for her colleague, and was prematurely cut off. He was succeeded by a series of Persian Governors, whose oppressions so irritated the population that about six years ago an open agitation was commenced. The leader was a very able Kurdish Mollah, named Gazi Fetha, and he gained such influence over his compatriots that the Persian Government was compelled to treat with them after three successive Governors had been forcibly ejected from Soujboulak and Tabreez within the space of a few weeks. The Ottoman Consuls at Soujboulak and Tabreez acted as intermediaries, and Gazi Fetha and some of the leading Kurds were at last induced to come to Tabreez on a safe conduct, which the Turkish Consulate at Tabreez guaranteed. The demands they presented were, first, that the Governor of Soujboulak should always be chosen from amongst themselves, and, secondly, that the taxes they already paid should not be increased, and that generally they should be freed from Persian oppression and interference. The first point was rejected, but full satisfaction on the second was promised them. Gazi Fetha was, however, treacherously seized and sent to Tehran, in spite of the protests of the Turkish Consul. He has never returned, and I do not know whether he still lives.

Since then the state of the Soujboulak Kurds has gone from bad to worse. For a time they were kept from united action by the usual Persian method of sowing dissensions in their midst, but of late things have changed, and all have turned against Mehmet Agha, the "Amir-el-Ashair" appointed by the Shah under the Governor to control the Kurds. This man is Chief of the important Mamash tribe, and originally obtained his post by adhering to the Persian cause at the time of Sheikh Obeidullah's invasion, less perhaps out of loyalty than because the Sheikh appointed a rival to command the Soujboulak contingent instead of himself.

Mehmet Agha, who resides at Lahijan, has become very unpopular, and is deserted even by his own tribe. To supply this defection I hear that several hundred Karapapak horsemen have been sent to him from Suldug. The Karapapaks are Shiah Tartars from the other side of the Araxes, who were settled in the Suldug district when their own home was ceded to Russia after the last war.

Last year two Soujboulak Chiefs were driven into exile in Turkey through Mehmet Agha's intrigues, and there is little doubt that any interference of the Sultan's Government in Soujboulak would be welcomed by the inhabitants generally. At present, however, there seems nothing to prove that the action of the Turks on Persian territory is anything more than an ordinary trespass, though there is some danger lest it may encourage the Kurds to take steps which they would otherwise shrink from.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. WRATISLAW.

No. 109.

Mr. R. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 237.)
My Lord,

Tehran, November 1, 1905.

I FEEL it my duty to bring to your Lordship's notice the anarchical state of the Province of Fars under the rule of his Imperial Highness the Shoa-es-Sultaneh, the second son of the present Shah.

This Prince obtained the Governorship of Fars last year, and, in spite of constant protestations of friendship to His Majesty's Government, our interests in that province have been neglected by the local authorities to a degree unequalled in my experience.

The Shoa-es-Sultaneh has all the failings of the Kajar family, being vicious, cruel, tyrannical, and incompetent. He affects to be very European and enlightened, but, except an outside varnish acquired in the music halls of Paris and Berlin, his Imperial Highness is merely a savage, and the fact that he suffers both from epilepsy, syphilis,

maniacal pride, and a variety of other ailments, renders him not only undesirable, but even dangerous as a ruler.

Since he has been at Shiraz, both His Majesty's Consul at that place and His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire, have made constant complaints to Sir Arthur Hardinge and myself of the prevailing anarchy and the insecurity of the roads, especially those leading to Bushire and on the borders of the Province of Kerman. The Kashgai and various Arab tribes pillage caravans with perfect impunity, and the road guards of the Prince are among the most dreaded of the robbers.

I need hardly say that His Majesty's Legation has made constant representations, both written and verbal, to the Grand Vizier and the Mushir-ed-Dowleh on the subject, but beyond vague promises and notes stating that "steps will be taken," no serious effort has been made to ameliorate a state of things which will end by driving British commerce out of South Persia.

The Persian Government is growing yearly weaker and more incapable, and I am personally convinced that the only effective method of dealing with the policing of the roads in question and the roads of South Persia in general, would be to organize local road guards under British officers.

Sooner or later, I believe, this will have to be done, and it is of course for His Majesty's Government to determine whether or not the time has arrived to take the requisite steps to safeguard British commercial interests in these regions.

I will not weary your Lordship by sending for perusal the large correspondence existing in our recent archives in regard to the chaos reigning in Fars. I merely inclose a copy of a letter from the Shoa-es-Sultaneh to Mr. Consul Graham, which adequately illustrates the tone of that Prince in regard to foreign interests, together with correspondence relating to the last incident which has taken place at Shiraz. The Sirdar Akram is the Prince's Vazir. He is corrupt, incompetent, and insolent, and I trust my action in regard to his latest behaviour in causing to be beaten a muleteer sent by Mr. Graham to the Karguzar as a witness, will meet with your Lordship's approval.

I have had several complaints lately of the insolence of Persian officials to our Consuls, and I have been obliged to inform the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that I may be driven to bring this matter prominently to your Lordship's notice.

The ingress of large numbers of low-caste Belgians and others into this country, has lowered the whole attitude of Persians towards Europeans, and I think it essential that when cases of unveiled insolence towards our Consuls occur, that the Persian Government should be made to understand that His Majesty's Government will not tolerate such conduct.

I wish to record my firm conviction that the present Persian Government believe His Majesty's Government will bear anything rather than take such a measure as sending ships to Bushire. Messages, however strongly delivered to the present Grand Vizier, produce no effect whatever, as he thinks that they are merely words and that no serious action will follow. A threat to take active measures if the Persian Government continue to maintain their obstructive and unreasonable attitude towards us, would produce a most healthy effect, and would go far to obtain settlement of our outstanding and just claims, which now amount to certainly over 20,000*l*.

I have recently been told by several of my foreign colleagues that, in their opinion, the time is rapidly approaching when some joint action will have to be taken to force the Persian Government to meet their liabilities.

I earnestly hope your Lordship will give this matter very serious attention, as I am confident that the opinions above expressed are sound and shared by every British official in Persia.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 109.

Prince Shoa-es-Sultaneh to Mr. Graham.

(Translation.)

September 14, 1904.

YOUR letter dated the 2nd Rejeb has been received. As in the matter of the complaint of Haji Muhammad Mehdi, British subject, against Mirza Ali Arghar, you had made certain statements to me, I have to say, in reply, that—

1. The Governors of the provinces have not an official responsibility to maintain and carry out the stipulations of the Treaties with other Governments, and only the
[1598] X

Representatives of the two Powers (i.e., the Central Government?) are responsible for the said Treaty.

2. In questions which may arise between subjects of the two Powers, the duty of the British Consulate is to refer to the Karguzar for discussion and interrogation, with a view to settling and terminating the business of its subject, and if the Karguzari fails to settle the matter and to fulfil its official obligations, and if there should arise between it and the Hakonmet a difference and the matter be delayed, then the Consulate must give notice to the Legation, and the Legation must take steps in the matter with the Persian Foreign Office. Nevertheless, by the impulse (insistence) of my own friendly feeling and goodwill towards the British Government, and my friendship towards the British Minister, and my solicitude to confirm and raise the structure of this friendship and good feeling, I am ready, in a friendly way, to further your request, but as Haji Muhammad Mehdi has written in the paper, of which you sent a copy, the fount and source of his complaint, and what he has written are disjointed sentences. Send him to me on Saturday, the 6th Rejeb, which is one of my days for hearing petitions and deciding cases, that he may come and state his own case, and an arrangement be made for settling his claim and complaint, or let him write out his grievances from beginning to end in a new statement. After the necessary investigations, when I have found out really how the matter stands, I will write you my orders.

Inclosure 2 in No. 109.

Mr. Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 101.)

Sir,

Shiraz, October 7, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that on the 2nd October I addressed a note to the Karguzar, notifying a theft recently reported to me to have occurred on the 22nd August last near Kuloon-i-Abdari of one bale of goods, the property of Messrs. Dixon. I inclosed the statements of muleteers Seyyid Khoda Rahm and Gholam regarding this robbery, and sent the two men with the letter and my farrash to the Karguzar requesting the necessary steps.

I may mention that it is a usual thing here for the local authorities to call for the production of the muleteers in cases of notification of road robberies, presumably in order to ascertain that there had not been collusion between the muleteers and the robbers.

Yesterday evening Seyyid Khoda Rahm came to this Consulate and stated that, having been sent by the Karguzar with his servant on the 5th October to the Sirdar-i-Akrum for examination, his Excellency, after questioning him, caused him to be thrown down and beaten.

I have to-day caused the muleteer's statement to be taken down in writing, in triplicate, and sealed by him. The man at the same time exhibited to me recent scars on both legs. I am now sending one copy of the muleteer's statement to the Karguzar, requesting him to transmit it to his Excellency Mushir-ed-Dowleh; and I inclose herewith another copy for such action as you may see fit.

I need scarcely point out that, if muleteers sent by me through the Karguzar to his Excellency the Vazir of Fars are liable to treatment of this nature, my difficulties in dealing with cases of road robbery may be greatly increased.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. GRAHAME.

Inclosure 3 in No. 109.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

Tehran, October 30, 1905.

LAST Wednesday I had the honour to bring verbally to your notice the conduct of the Sirdar-i-Akrum, Vazir of Fars, in causing to be beaten a muleteer who had been sent to the Karguzar by His Majesty's Consul at Shiraz, to give evidence in regard to the robbery at Kuloon-i-Abdari of goods belonging to Messrs. Dixon.

As this action on the part of the Vazir of Fars shows grave disrespect to His Majesty's Consulate, I request your Excellency to give official instructions to call upon Mr. Grahame and tender a formal apology.

I am bringing this case to the notice of the Marquess of Lansdowne in order that his Lordship may be aware of the disrespectful attitude of the authorities in Fars towards His Majesty's Consul; and I am also reporting on the entire absence of security existing in that province and in Southern Persia generally.

I may add that I am furnishing his Lordship with a copy of a letter written by the Shoa-es-Sultaneh to Mr. Grahame, which clearly shows how little His Imperial Highness understands the duties of the Governor of a Persian province towards foreign subjects.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

No. 110.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.---(Received December 16.)

(No. 238.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 5, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 214, Confidential, of the 8th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith further correspondence on the subject of the Urmi murder case.

As I had the honour to inform your Lordship in my telegram No. 131 of the 12th ultimo, Mr. Pearson, the United States' Minister, in spite of my urgent request, started for the Caucasus without giving any instructions to his Vice-Consul or so much as leaving him a cypher with which to communicate with Washington. It appears that Mr. Pearson suspects, and perhaps not without cause, that Mr. Tyler was concerned with the American Presbyterian Mission in trying to bring about his recall last year, and distrusts him accordingly.

The proceedings of Bagher Khan, the Persian Commissioner, have been very unsatisfactory. Before he left Tabreez he made no effort to conceal his intention of disregarding all evidence against the Dasht Kurds (see Mr. Wratislaw's despatch of 1st October). In spite of the strong representations made by Mr. Tyler with my support, Bagher Khan allowed his prisoners to proceed toward Urmi in complete liberty and armed. At a place called Dilman they separated from the Persian Commissioner, and did not even enter Urmi, but were escorted in triumph to their villages by members of their tribes, committing another murder on the way home. That prisoners accused of an atrocious murder should be permitted, while proceeding to their trial, to behave in this way appeared to me so preposterous that I laid the matter before your Lordship, and, in obedience to your instructions, I at once informed the United States' Legation and the Persian Government that, unless the Kurds were arrested, His Majesty's Government could not allow Mr. Wratislaw to attend the inquiry. I also repeated your Lordship's telegram No. 75 of the 26th ultimo to Mr. Wratislaw.

Mr. Pearson only returned yesterday to Tehran, and I have not yet been furnished with his observations as to Mr. Wratislaw's telegram of the 3rd instant, a paraphrase of which accompanies this despatch.

This being the month of Ramazan, I do not suppose that any progress will be made at Urmi for some weeks. Ramazan is always made an excuse by the Persian Government for every form of obstruction and neglect of duty.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 110.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 44. Confidential.)

Sir,

Tabreez, October 1, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegrams Nos. 60 and 62, on the subject of the arrival at Tabreez of Bagher Khan and his attitude regarding the mission intrusted to him, I have

the honour to report that this gentleman makes no effort to conceal his intention of disregarding all evidence against the Dasht Kurds. In the course of conversation I mentioned to him the various points which I consider to inculpate these men, such as the report of Majid-es-Sultani's original inquiry made by order of the Persian Government immediately after the crime, the depositions I took last year at Urmī, and the damaging fact that articles identified as having been taken by Mr. Labaree on his last journey had been found in a Dasht village and brought thence to me. Bagher Khan replied in an airy manner that Majid-es-Sultani's report was obviously calumnious and inspired by malice, and that no trust could be placed in the depositions of Nestorians who were also brimful of malice. I then asked him how he intended to execute his instructions to inquire into the murder of Mr. Labaree and punish the perpetrators of it. He replied that he considered the Tehran Kurds as already proved to be innocent, and that as for Saidi and Fathullah, he should, on arriving at Urmī, call together the leading men of the town and ask them whether they considered these men as innocent or guilty, and that he should act according to their opinion. He added that humanity and justice were the ideals which had inspired him throughout life, and that nothing would induce him to condemn Kurds whom he knew to be innocent.

Bagher Khan's conception of a judicial inquiry appears to me to be beyond all criticism. He is apparently serious in intending to follow the procedure indicated above, and in conversation with various persons here has even mentioned the names of the Urmī Notables whose opinion he will consult. These are Haji Musteshar, the Begzade's chief friend and supporter in Urmī, with Haji Sadik Khan and Sadik-el-Memalik, two of his satellites, and Nassir-ed-Dowleh and the Vali of Urmī, who are timorous nonentities, and can be trusted to give the answer which is expected of them. I believe that all these gentlemen signed the Memorial mentioned in my telegram No. 22 of the 22nd March.

From several credible sources I hear that Bagher Khan has informed the Tehran Kurds that their safety is assured, and confirmation of this is afforded by their request to the Governor-General (which, presumably by some misunderstanding, was delivered in my presence) that they should be allowed to return to their homes. As reported in my telegram No. 62, I pointed out to the Governor-General the serious consequences which would be entailed were they not kept in custody, at least till the inquiry is over. At the present moment they are allowed to walk about Tabreez in perfect freedom. If they are permitted to go to Urmī otherwise than as prisoners the impression produced there will be that they are regarded by the Persian Government as innocent men and any small chance which at present exists of procuring evidence against them will vanish. In any case Bagher Khan ought to be forbidden to send them home until the United States' Minister has had time to consider my report on the inquiry after its termination. Once released it will be very difficult to catch them again.

Bagher Khan's attitude does not permit me to hope for a satisfactory result to his mission to Urmī. He has evidently received orders to acquit the Dasht Kurds, and, independently of this, it is obvious that his only chance of recouping himself for his expenses and putting a little money in his pocket lies in selling his protection to the Kurds and Mirza Hussein Agha.

The latter has received a letter from Tehran assuring him that his troubles are over, and Bagher Khan has further promised to see him through. If Mirza Hussein Agha returns triumphantly to Urmī we may as well throw up the sponge at once. As stated in my telegram No. 62, a very desirable contrary effect would be produced were he to be called to Tehran before I leave for Urmī.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. C. WRATISLAW.

Inclosure 2 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, October 12, 1905.

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your note of yesterday, inclosing a précis of a telegram from Mr. Wratislaw, His Majesty's Consul-General at Tabreez, relating to the approaching trial of the accused Kurds as accomplices in the murder of the late Mr. Labaree.

In the telegram referred to Mr. Wratislaw asks whether the American Minister wishes him to insist on the arrest of Saidi and Fathullah as a preliminary to the inquiry, and indicates that, in his opinion, the step is advisable.

I have the honour to state that I entirely concur in this view, on the ground that it is necessary that as many of the accused as it is possible to bring into court should be present at the same time. I beg, however, to add that, providing these men have escaped across the frontier into Turkey, a very strong proof of their guilt, I think the trial should proceed in their absence, when the evidence incriminating them could be produced, and, if found guilty, sentence, *absente cor*, be pronounced against them.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 3 in No. 110.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tabreez, October 12, 1905.

BAGHER has to-day informed me in writing, in reply to my communication, that he has no orders to retain Kurds in custody. They made, he says, no attempt to escape during the journey from the capital, and he is of opinion that there is no fear of their doing so between Urmī and Tabreez. It would, he adds, be impolitic to arrest them, as they have agreed to induce Saidi and Fathullah "to attend the trial."

Perhaps they have received assurances of immunity so satisfactory that they will not attempt to escape, but if they bolt it will be impossible to retake them.

Please inform American Minister that their return in semi-triumph to Urmī will produce an effect I shall find it impossible to struggle against with success.

On Saturday morning I leave for Urmī and must leave above matter entirely to Mr. Pearson.

Inclosure 4 in No. 110.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Wratislaw.

(No. 23.)
Sir,

Tehran, October 13, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith a copy of a letter from the United States' Vice-Consul, inclosing the official list of the Kurdish prisoners brought to Tehran.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 5 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Dear Mr. Grant Duff,

American Legation (undated).

If you are writing to Mr. Wratislaw you might inclose the names of the men who were brought to Tehran as pretended prisoners, for him to compare with names that will be given at the inquiry. I think probably they will be different.

Yours, &c.
(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Names of Kurdish prisoners brought to Tehran, as supplied by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs:—

Gurgin Beg Shojai-Lashkar,
Kuli Beg,
Ali Khan, Uli,
Mirza Kader Khan,
Sirah Beg.

Inclosure 6 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,
American Legation, Tehran, October 13, 1905.
 I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication, inclosing a paraphrase of a telegram from Mr. Wratishaw reporting the attitude assumed by Mirza Bagher Khan towards the Kurdish prisoners returned from Tehran to be tried in Urmī as accomplices in the murder of the late Mr. Labaree.
 It appears that Mirza Bagher Khan has informed Mr. Wratishaw that he has no orders to retain the Kurds in custody, assuming thereby that they are innocent of the charge for which the Persian Government arrested them; and that from the side most open to suspicion. He has heard nothing of the incriminating testimony which will be brought against these criminals, and yet he takes upon himself the responsibility of practically denying their guilt.
 I shall, in a note I propose to write to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, require that these men be taken from Tabreez to Urmī as criminals arrested on the charge of being active accomplices in the murder of the late Mr. Labaree.

I have &c.
 (Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 7 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,
American Legation, Tehran, October 18, 1905.
 I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note, inclosing a paraphrase of a telegram from His Majesty's Acting Consul-General at Tabreez informing you that Mirza Bagher Khan had left for Urmī, and that the accused Kurds had preceded him as free men in possession of their firearms and ammunition. While I deplore this inconsistent and reprehensible conduct on the part of the Persian Commissioner, I feel that, under the circumstances, I have done all that was in my power.
 I have not the least doubt that Mr. Wratishaw will use every possible means to secure the ends of justice, and if there should, in his opinion, be a miscarriage, the responsibility will rest with the Persian Government. In such case the American Government will, I presume, know what further measures are necessary to protect its honour and the lives and interests of its citizens.

I have, &c.
 (Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 8 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,
American Legation, Tehran, October 18, 1905.
 I HAVE the honour to inclose, for your information and such disposal as you may deem necessary, a copy and translation of the reply to Mr. Pearson's note to the Minister for Foreign Affairs on the 11th instant, which, I believe, was at the time brought to your notice.

I have, &c.
 (Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 9 in No. 110.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. Tyler.

(Translation.)

Ministry for Foreign Affairs, October 17, 1905.

I HAVE understood the contents of the note of the Legation of the 4th instant regarding the necessary inquiry into the case of the murder of Mr. Labaree.
 It is stated therein that the witnesses whose evidence in the investigation is necessary will not, on account of the fear they have of the Kurds, appear to give testimony. This information is the cause of surprise, for the Kurds of those regions are at enmity with each other, and most of them are, in matters of injustice, ready to give evidence against one another. How much more, then, where justice is clear? But, in view of the representations of the Legation and in order to facilitate the inquiry, necessary instructions have been sent to the authorities in Urmī and to the Commissioner that, in such a way as may be considered sufficient and effective, they shall provide the means of protection and assurance that they may tender such testimony as they may have, and no one will have the boldness in any way to molest them.

Furthermore, it is stated that, if the Persian Government fails to afford protection to these witnesses, may the American Government have permission to undertake this duty? This statement has been the cause of astonishment, for it is plainly evident that the Persian Government will give protection and security to its subjects so that it will never be necessary for the Legation to interfere; and any measures which the Legation may take in this connection will be considered a violation of the terms of the solemn Treaty.

With respect to the indemnity mentioned in the note, under no circumstances has this been reported, and no confirmation of the statement has been received by the authorities.

The object of the Government in appointing the Court of Inquiry in Urmī, both in its inception and intention, is in accordance with what has been definitely arranged with the Legation, and in conformity with which the necessary steps will be fully taken.

As soon as the Government Commissioner arrives in Urmī he will, in association with the Representative of the American Government, open the Court, and a joint inquiry will be instituted.

(Signed) Mushir-ed Dowleh.

Inclosure 10 in No. 110.

Consul-General Wratishaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.
Urmī, October 21, 1905.
 BAGHER remained two days at Dilman. The Kurds separated from him there and came in from Tabreez in complete liberty. They did not enter the city, but were yesterday escorted in triumph to their villages by members of their tribe, who rode out to meet them, committing a murder on the way. Please inform the American Minister that the Kurds may possibly come in for the inquiry, but that, if they do so, I shall refuse to be present unless they are at once taken into custody and kept there until the close of the proceedings.

Inclosure 11 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,
American Legation, Tehran, October 23, 1905.
 I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note inclosing a paraphrase of a telegram received to-day from His Majesty's Consul-General now in Urmī.
 I have just returned from an interview on the subject with the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to whom I have expressed the expectations of the American Government, as a

result of the presence of the Consul-General at this inquiry, and that unless these men are brought into Urmi and put upon their trial forthwith I shall feel it my duty to report the circumstances to my Government. He wrote out a telegram to Bagher Khan while I stayed and ordered it to be dispatched immediately.

If convenient to you I will call at the Legation at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning for a further consultation as to what had best be done to enforce Mr. Wratislaw's demands.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 12 in No. 110.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Tyler.

Sir, I LEARN that a paraphrase of Lord Lansdowne's telegram was duly sent to you, instructing me that unless the accused Kurds were arrested Mr. Wratislaw could not be permitted to attend the inquiry at Urmi. Mr. Wratislaw has also been so informed.

I have the honour to acquaint you that I have this day conveyed the above information to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, at the same time reminding his Excellency that I warned him verbally of what would be the probable consequences of allowing desperate men accused of murder to proceed to Urmi with the Persian Commissioner fully armed and at liberty.

From several conversations I have had the honour to have with you I think that I am not wrong in believing that you agree with me as to the necessity of insisting on the prompt arrest of the accused Kurds, and their maintenance as prisoners unless and until they are acquitted after a properly conducted trial.

I need hardly say that I shall continue to afford you all the assistance I properly can in bringing pressure to bear on the Persian Government to obtain the arrest of the Kurds in question, and the orderly conduct of the inquiry in which our respective Governments are interested.

I may add that should you wish to forward any message to the State Department at Washington, I shall be happy to transmit it in cypher through His Majesty's Embassy at that capital.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 13 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mushir-ed Dowleh.

Your Excellency, I HAVE just been informed by the British Legation that His Britannic Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has telegraphed that unless the accused Kurds are placed under arrest Mr. Wratislaw, the Consul-General, is not to attend the Court of Inquiry.

In my interview with your Excellency on the 25th instant I urged you to telegraph to Mirza Bagher Khan to have the Kurds re-arrested and held as prisoners until either acquitted or condemned by the Tribunal.

If as you declared at the interview it were necessary to holding these men as prisoners during the trial you would have to lay the case before His Majesty. I have to request that you will do this immediately, in order that Mr. Wratislaw may attend the inquiry, and the proceedings be conducted in an orderly and serious manner.

Your Excellency must understand that if Mr. Wratislaw is dissatisfied with the formalities of the Court and refuses to attend I have no choice but to report the circumstances to the American Government and ask for further instructions, but I sincerely hope that this will not be necessary.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 14 in No. 110.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

Tehran, October 27, 1905.

I BROUGHT to the notice of His Majesty's Government the fact that the Kurds accused of complicity in the murder of Mr. Labaree were allowed by the Persian Government to proceed from Tabreez to Urmi armed and in perfect liberty, and that they were escorted in triumph to their villages by the Kurdish tribesmen. I had, as your Excellency will remember, warned you what was too likely to happen if desperate men accused of murder were allowed to proceed thus with the Persian Commissioner to the scene of the inquiry, there to stand their trial on the capital charge.

Your Excellency merely replied that such was the custom in Persia as regards untried men accused of crime.

I have now the honour to inform your Excellency that unless the accused Kurds are at once arrested and brought to Urmi as prisoners His Majesty's Government will be unable to permit Mr. Wratislaw to attend the inquiry.

In these circumstances I request your Excellency to send immediate orders to the proper authorities that the Kurds accused or suspected of complicity in Mr. Labaree's murder or the attack on Captain Gough be arrested and kept as prisoners unless and until they are acquitted after a properly conducted inquiry held in the presence of Mr. Wratislaw.

I avail, &c.
(For Mr. E. Grant Duff).
(Signed) G. J. KIDSTON.

Inclosure 15 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, October 28, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, with reference to Mr. Wratislaw's instructions from His Majesty's Secretary of State not to attend the trial of the Kurds unless they were held under strict arrest until the decision of the Tribunal were pronounced.

I quite agree with you that it would not be safe for Mr. Wratislaw to attend unless these men were placed in such a position that would preclude the possibility of their doing harm or interfering with the orderly conduct of the trial.

I also beg to renew my assurance that you may rely on my full and sincere co-operation in any steps that you may consider necessary for the peaceful and judicial examination of the case. I may, however, be allowed to express my conviction that neither the Persian Government nor the Commissioners apprehend the importance or seriousness of its duty in the trial of these men.

Subsequently to my visit to His Majesty's Legation yesterday, I addressed a note to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, requesting him to lay the case before the Shah if he could not undertake the responsibility of ordering the arrest and safe keeping of the Kurds.

I furthermore indicated that if this were not done I should have to ask for further instructions from the American Government.

I beg to thank you very heartily for the efficient and courteous co-operation which you have afforded me, &c.

(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 16 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, October 31, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that I have just now received the original of the inclosed from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, which refers to my letter of the 15th.

27th instant, asking for the immediate arrest and detention as prisoners of the Kurds during the trial in Urmi.

If you have any further information on the subject from Mr. Wratislaw, I shall be much obliged if you will kindly let me know the nature of it.

If convenient to you I will call at the Legation to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 17 in No. 110.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. Tyler.

(Translation.)

Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Tehran, Ramazan 1, 1323.

I HAVE received your communication of the 27th of Shaaban, and have understood the contents.

As the reply to the subject stated therein depends upon an audience of His Majesty the Shah, it will be better for you to come to my house on Wednesday towards evening that we may discuss the matter between ourselves.

(Sealed) Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Inclosure 18 in No. 110.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 73. Secret.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Urmi, October 30, 1905.

Guwegin* has informed me in a verbal message that—

1. He is prepared to hand over, for such punishment as I may choose to inflict, the men of Tamar Bay who shot at Gough;

2. That he will bring in the men accused of murdering Labaree if I guarantee that their trial shall be "in accordance with the bonds of justice," but that they will not come otherwise.

Seeing that the trial is not in my hands, I do not see how I could give the required guarantee. I propose to send him an answer to the effect that I am willing to discuss the whole matter with him if he will arrange a meeting, but that I cannot pay attention to verbal messages.

If I could arrange that the Kurds should acknowledge that they had been accessories after the fact, and should hand over for public flogging some, if not all, of the men whom we accuse, would this satisfy the American Government? I entertain no hope of being able to bring guilt home to them if the inquiry proceeds normally, as much of our evidence cannot be made use of publicly. The situation is a most difficult one, and I strongly recommend some such arrangement, if possible, as the best solution. I can undertake that any plan recommended by me would be loyally accepted by the American missionaries. Guwegin may, of course, be simply fishing for information, and I cannot at present be sure that he is serious in his overtures.

It is important that the Persian Government should not be informed of this matter.

Inclosure 19 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, November 2, 1905.

AFTER my visit to the Legation and conversation with you yesterday, I had an interview with the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

I presented to his Excellency a Memorandum urgently requesting that the accused Kurds be arrested and brought to Urmi as prisoners; that they should be immediately placed in strict confinement and deprived of their arms and every possible thing that could be used to inflict bodily harm or for the purpose of intimidation; and, further,

* Dr. Eady Gurgin.

that while these men were under arrest and the inquiry proceeding no relatives, friends, or fellow-tribesmen should be allowed either to enter the city of Urmi or to come into the neighbourhood.

The Minister, in reply, said that he concurred in these requests, and he believed the culprits would be speedily arrested, and assured me that the other demands should be strictly complied with, adding that he would communicate the terms of my Memorandum to the Persian Commissioner. He also told me that my note of the 27th October had been shown to His Majesty, who said the Kurds were to be arrested as soon as possible.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

Inclosure 20 in No. 110.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 74.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Urmi, November 3, 1905.

YOUR telegram No. 46.

The meaning of the passage to which you refer in my telegram No. 73 was that, as it was extremely improbable that we should be able to produce evidence of the complicity of the Kurds, the American Government might be willing to accept as sufficient satisfaction the flogging of the men on our list on condition that they should confess to being at least accessories. If I were authorized to undertake that they should not be punished vindictively it might be possible to obtain a wider confession, but of this I cannot be sure until I have had an interview with Gurwin. I fear that, unless I have a confession of some sort to aid me, I shall be forced to agree with the Persian Commissioner that the conviction of the Kurds is not justified by the evidence, and I presume such a termination of the inquiry would be as little to the liking of the American Government as to my own.

I should like to know the minimum of punishment which the American Government will require, for I am quite in the dark as to their views on this subject. They can hardly press for the execution of the accomplices, for they have accepted imprisonment for the chief criminal. Provided the accused confess and throw themselves on our mercy, I should think that imprisonment of some of them for a term of years and the flogging of others would be ample. In order to avert the possibility of worse punishment they might agree to this, for they probably do not know how weak our case is.

Inclosure 21 in No. 110.

Mr. Tyler to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, November 3, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd instant, covering a paraphrase of a telegraphic message from His Majesty's Consul-General regarding the situation at Urmi, and specially directing my attention to the last paragraph.

Before, however, giving my opinion on this aspect of the case it may help us to understand certain elements more clearly if I rectify the name "Guwegin." This is no doubt a mutilation by the Persian telegraphists of "Gurgin," given by the Persian Foreign Office as "Gurgin Khan, Shoja-i-Lashkar," and by the late Dr. Cochran as "Gurgin Beg, of Ambi," and the principal arrest of the prisoners now turned back to Urmi by Mirza Bagher Khan.

In Dr. Cochran's list of suspects and statement of character and evidence against them, he says:

"Nakhshoo, son of Amin, servant of Gurgin Beg, of Ambi, and Biru, servant of Gurgin Beg, of Ambi.

"Character.—These men are robbers for Gurgin Beg. They are acquainted with Sahmas and Khoi roads and formerly lived there in the Shekoik country."

It appears, therefore, that the man who has placed himself in communication with Mr. Wratislaw has throughout been suspected as an accessory either before or after the

fact, at all events, of concealing two of the culprits implicated in a higher degree of guilt and himself actually arrested and detained for some months until liberated by the Persian Commissioner at Dilman.

It seems to me that Gurgin Beg's putting himself in communication with Mr. Wratislaw is part of a preconcerted plan between the Commissioner and himself for the purpose of shifting the responsibility of a refusal to surrender by the accused on a condition of punishment on to Mr. Wratislaw and to exculpate the Commissioner from blame in setting his prisoners free. I may be in error, but the preliminaries leading up to this attitude favour the conjecture; and it is probable that Mr. Wratislaw's known powers of observation and calculating foresight will have led him to avoid the trap. This presumption would seem to be justified by his refusal to receive verbal messages from Gurgin Beg.

My conversation with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, after delivering my Memorandum on the 1st instant, turned again to the apparent neglect of duty and inexpediency of liberating the men by the Commissioner. His Excellency said it was on the understanding with and the promise of these men to deliver up the guilty that they were allowed to go to their villages. I replied that no doubt the Government held Mirza Bagher Khan responsible for his act and he said he did. "But," I said, "if they refuse to surrender themselves or present others, what shall you do." He replied: "Take them by force."

With regard to the first and second paragraphs, I agree with Wratislaw that he should not give a guarantee that the trial of the accused "should be in accordance with the bonds of justice." The Persian Commissioner is mainly responsible for the formation and procedure of the inquiry.

With respect to the last paragraph, I feel that to offer an opinion or advice on the kind or extent of punishment providing they make a general confession, without being acquainted with the degree of their guilt, is very difficult and might lead to a misapprehension and question of my authority. I think, however, that, should Mr. Wratislaw consider that the minor charge of being accessory after the fact is all that can be proved against the culprits, he would be justified, as he holds, I presume, authority from the American Government to act in such case in exercising his judgment as to the form and the measure of their punishment.

As Mr. Pearson will reach Tehran to-morrow evening, I do not think I ought to make any further remarks on the subject.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOHN TYLER.

No. 111.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne,--(Received December 16.)

(No. 239.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 5, 1905.

IN my telegrams Nos. 130, 131, and 134, I had the honour to bring before your Lordship the attitude of the Persian Government in regard to the Urmî Mujtehed and Majid-es-Sultaneh, together with the reasons stated for their failure to carry out the assurances given to Sir Arthur Hardinge that the former would be sent either to Tehran or Meshed.

While there is no doubt that the Persian Government gave the assurances referred to, it is fair to them to admit that recently the position of affairs in Azerbaijan has undergone a change. I have in a previous despatch reported that Tabreez and other towns in Northern Persia have been considerably affected by the disturbances at Baku. I do not think the Grand Vizier wrong in saying that the removal of a prominent Mujtehed from Tabreez at the present moment, when the Governor-General of Azerbaijan is doing his best to suppress popular excitement, might not improbably lead to some untoward event. It is also, I believe, true that the Mujtehed is infirm, and possible that his removal might cause a demonstration in his favour at Urmî, where, as the principal Mollah of the place, he is much respected.

As regards the Majid-es-Sultaneh, the position of the Persian Government is also one of some difficulty. If the Shah allowed him to leave his asylum at His Majesty's Consulate-General for Europe, Persians who wished, for reasons of their own, to proceed to Russia without permission, might, on some frivolous pretext, or to escape just

punishment, take "bast" with the Russian Consul-General, who is usually ready to take up such cases, and the case of the Majid would then be quoted as a precedent.

Finding the Grand Vizier intractable and obstinate, I suggested as a possible solution that if his Highness would give me a written guarantee that the Majid-es-Sultaneh and his property would be assured against molestation if he left our Consulate-General, I would, on my part, do what I properly could to induce your Lordship to drop the question of the removal of the Mujtehed, provided always that adequate precautions be taken to prevent the latter from interfering to defeat the ends of justice at Urmî.

Since the receipt of your Lordship's telegram No. 74 of the 25th ultimo, I have tried my best to persuade the Ain-ed-Dowleh and the Mushir-ed-Dowleh to induce the Shah to allow the Majid-es-Sultaneh to go to Europe, but in vain. After a long conversation with his Highness yesterday, finding him quite unreasonable, and thinking that it might be politic not to press the matter too far, I agreed to solve the difficulty as proposed in my telegram No. 134 of the 21st ultimo.

His Highness was obviously greatly relieved, and thanked me profusely, and I arranged as soon as possible to arrange notes with him in the above sense.

I transmit such correspondence as has lately passed on the subject, but the negotiations have been chiefly carried on verbally.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 111.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 25, 1905.

IN reply to your note of the 28th ultimo, respecting Haji Mirza Hussein Agha, Mujtehed of Urmî, I have the honour to state that this person, who is far away from his home, is suffering from illness, and since he has come to Tabreez has done nothing to attract attention. I do not see why so much importance is given to his removal from Tabreez while he does not interfere with any business, and if he had done so the Persian Government would have known it better.

Under the above circumstances the British Government should not allow the Persian Government to be troubled for such an unimportant matter, and give labour both to itself and to the Persian Government.

I trust you will consider the unimportance of this matter (to you), and the great difficulty the removal of this old and infirm man will cause the Persian Government.

Inclosure 2 in No. 111.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 29, 1905.

THE purport of your note of the 21st September regarding Majid-es-Sultaneh was submitted to His Imperial Majesty the Shah, who was graciously pleased to issue the command that he, like other subjects and employés of the Persian Government, enjoys security of life and property, and no one has, or will have, any objection to him. He can, therefore, without any anxiety, conduct his own business, but he must for the present give up the intention of asking for permission to go to Europe, as it is against his present and future interests.

The above is communicated for your information.

Inclosure 3 in No. 111.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Atabeg-i-Azma (Grand Vizier).

Your Highness,

October 19, 1905.

IMMEDIATELY after the conversation I had the honour to have with your Highness on the 12th instant, I telegraphed to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the effect that you declined to fulfil your promise to remove Haji Mirza Hussein Agha, the Urmî Mujtehed, either to Tehran or Meshed. I added that your Highness would instruct the Ain-es-Sultaneh to explain to his Lordship the

reasons which prevent you from carrying out the assurances on the subject given to His Majesty's Minister.

I have the honour to state that I have to-day received instructions from Lord Lansdowne to inform your Highness that His Majesty's Government insist on the execution of the promise given by the Persian Government to remove the Mollah in question, either to Tehran or Meshed. I am to add that, if circumstances have arisen since that promise was given pointing to the advisability of delay, His Majesty's Government must be informed of them through His Majesty's Legation.

In these circumstances I request your Highness to be so good as to let me know, at an early date, such reasons as you may have for declining to fulfil the promise given to Sir Arthur Hardinge in regard to Haji Mirza Hussein Agha.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

No. 112.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 241.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 6, 1905.

SINCE writing my despatch No. 233 of the 3rd instant I have received from the Persian Government the note, translation of which I have the honour to inclose, on the subject of the importation of arms destined for His Majesty's Consulate-General at Meshed.

I have already transmitted to your Lordship the substance of the inclosed note in my telegram No. 142 of the 5th instant.

Your Lordship will perceive that the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, as before, declines to sanction the importation of the arms in question on the ground that such a concession might cause the failure of negotiations stated to be in progress to induce the Russian Government to remove certain arms forcibly brought by them into Persia some months ago.

I ventured to express the opinion in my telegram No. 142 that the Russian Government were unlikely to consent to remove their arms or the Persian Government to sanction the importation of arms for the use of His Majesty's Consulate-General at Meshed.

In a town like Meshed, which is full of knaves over whom the Government has no efficient control, it is evident that British subjects should have some means of defending themselves if attacked. As I have frequently had the honour to report, the starving and ill-clad horde of hatterdemalions, which constitute the so-called Persian army, would, in case of an attack on the Christians, be the first to butcher us, if it were in any way their interest to do so.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 112.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

November 3, 1905.

IN reply to your note of the 21st ultimo, respecting the permission for the import of arms and ammunition for the British Consulate-General at Meshed, I have the honour to inform you that the Persian Government are negotiating with the Russians respecting the previous case, and should the Persian Government grant the permission now asked for by the British Government, the negotiation in question will have no result.

I have no doubt that, in view of the friendship existing between the two Governments, the British authorities will not insist in the matter, which would frustrate the measures taken by the Persian Government in its own interests.

No. 113.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 242.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 7, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that I communicated verbally to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh the substance of your Lordship's telegram No. 78 of the 2nd instant, regarding the indirect compensation which the Russian Government propose to grant in the case of Companies who suffered loss during the recent troubles at Baku. His Excellency, in thanking me for the information, said that he would be very much obliged if your Lordship would eventually give him further particulars as to the actual assistance granted to British firms at Baku by the Russian Government. I replied that I would refer His Excellency's request to your Lordship.

He went on to say that, as the Russian Government had refused to pay direct compensation to Persians who suffered loss at Baku, and at the same time were pressing the Persian Government to make good the losses of Russian subjects during the Moharrem riots at Meshed in the spring of this year, His Majesty the Shah had ordered him to issue a Circular to the Heads of Missions at Tehran stating that in future the Persian Government would refuse to be responsible for losses suffered by foreigners in this country, whether by robbers or otherwise.

I said the Circular had not yet reached me, so that I could not discuss its contents officially, but I would privately warn His Excellency that I thought it highly improbable that His Majesty's Government would accept the view the Persian Government took of their responsibility, and I added that I questioned whether, if the Persian Government seriously adopted such a line of action, it might not involve them in difficulties.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

No. 114.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 243.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 138 of the 1st instant and your Lordship's telegram No. 77 of the 2nd instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith correspondence on the subject of the incident at Kuhak.

I think that the Mushir-ed-Dowleh's memory is at times rather defective, and in the present instance he genuinely forgot that he had promised to give me an undertaking in writing to the effect that, should the Kuhak buildings be hereafter required, the Persian Government would re-erect them. The conduct of the Yamin-i-Nizam was, however, inexcusable. Probably, Captain Macpherson's explanation of the reason for that official's proceedings (see my telegram No. 128) is correct.

The undertaking, translation of which I inclose, is rather oddly worded, and, like most Persian documents, somewhat vague; but Abbas Kuli Khan, Acting Oriental Secretary of this Legation, considers that it is sufficient to prevent the Government of the Shah from shirking their engagement, if called upon to replace the buildings at some future time. Although dated the 30th ultimo, it was received by me on the 4th instant.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure I in No. 114.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Your Excellency,

Tehran, November 3, 1905.

AS I had the honour to inform your Excellency, I reported to the British Government the action of the Yamin-i-Nizam in regard to the buildings at Kuhak occupied by the Seistan Delimitation Commission.

I am instructed by His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to acquaint your Excellency that His Majesty's Government are greatly surprised at the discourteous behaviour of the local Persian officials in taking advantage of the permission given to remove the buildings without previous consultation with or warning to His Majesty's Consul in charge, and expect suitable reparation will be made. I am also to inform you that if these buildings are required hereafter His Majesty's Government will, of course, hold the Persian Government to their promise.

I may add that I have not yet received the written undertaking from the Persian Government to re-erect these buildings if hereafter necessary, although your Excellency promised last Wednesday, for the second time, to let me have the document immediately.

I have the honour to request your Excellency to fulfil your promise without further delay, as I am sending despatches to London next week, and must send a translation of the document in question to Lord Lansdowne.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 2 in No. 114.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 30, 1905.

WITH regard to the mud-houses in Seistan which, as you stated, the Commissioners may require to be re-erected, should they return at the request of the Persian Government, I have the honour to inform you that the matter was laid before His Imperial Majesty the Shah, who commanded that, should the formation of another Commission on that frontier become necessary, and the Persian Government consider the return of the Commissioner desirable and permission for that purpose be given, orders for the erection of a sufficient number of mud-houses for them will be issued.

No. 115

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 215.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 8, 1905.

AS I had the honour to report to your Lordship in my telegram No. 111 of the 4th instant, I have at last received from the Persian Government a written reply, translation of which I inclose, on the subject of the alleged sale of Crown lands in Seistan.

It appears from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh's note that permission has not hitherto been granted by the Shah for the sale of lands belonging to the Crown in Seistan, but that the Persian Government consider that, if hereafter they decide to dispose of such property, they are at liberty to do so.

In view of the fact that the Persian Government maintain that under the existing Treaties (see my despatch No. 235 of the 4th instant) foreign subjects are debarred from holding land in any part of Persia, except by special permission of the Shah, it would seem hardly likely that lands in Seistan have been, or will be in the near future, alienated to foreigners.

I venture to think that the real explanation of the alleged transaction is, perhaps, this. The Amir-us-Zahb and the Ras-ul-Tajin, the merchants stated to have purchased the land in question, were really acting for the Grand Vizier, who wished to acquire a lien on the Seistan Crown lands as security, or part security, for a loan made by himself to the Shah, in their name, to meet the expenses of the royal tour in Europe.

I have tried to ascertain verbally from the Grand Vizier the true story of the transaction. His Highness merely replies that the whole story is a fabrication (a *baraghi*), &c. &c. &c. Pending the receipt of further instructions from your

Lordship, I have confined myself to an acknowledgment of the Mushir's communication, taking note of his statement regarding the alleged sale, and reminding his Excellency of the ex-Grand Vizier's note of the 5th December, 1901, and the Shah's autograph letter to his Highness of the 13th February, 1902 (see Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 26, Confidential, of the 16th February, 1902).

I inclose a copy of my note.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 115.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

November 3, 1905.

IN reply to your note of the 7th July last, regarding the rumour of the sale of the Seistan Crown lands, I have the honour to inform you that the matter was laid before His Imperial Majesty the Shah, who graciously stated that hitherto permission for the sale of the Seistan lands had not been given, but should the occasion arise the Persian Government is at liberty to sell the Crown lands and its own property.

Inclosure 2 in No. 115.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

November 6, 1905.

I HAD the honour to receive, and will forward to His Majesty's Government, a translation of your note of the 3rd instant, in which you state that His Majesty the Shah has hitherto not granted permission for the sale of Crown lands in Seistan, but that should the occasion arise the Persian Government consider themselves at liberty to dispose of the said lands, which are their own property.

In taking note of your Excellency's statement on this subject, I have the honour to remind you of the assurances given by the ex-Grand Vizier in his note of the 5th December, 1901, and of the contents of the autograph letter addressed to his Highness on the 13th February, 1902.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

No. 116.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 217.)

My Lord,

Tehran, November 14, 1905.

AS I had the honour to report in my telegram No. 146 of the 12th instant, on the occasion of His Majesty's Birthday, I awaited the Shah's Representative between the hours of 11 A.M. and 1 P.M., as officially arranged with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, and in accordance with long-established custom. No one appeared, although I sent a messenger to the Persian Foreign Office, and repeatedly telephoned to remind the individual designated by the Shah that I was awaiting his arrival.

The members of the staff of His Majesty's Legation and myself were in full uniform.

In a country like Persia, where all classes are most punctilious about ceremony, such conduct is insulting, and I thought it my duty to ask the Persian Government for explanations. I inclose their written apology, which they took three days to produce. I have acknowledged the receipt of the apology in the note, copy of which I have the honour to inclose, but I have verbally informed the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that until I receive your Lordship's instructions I do not consider the matter closed.

My reason for attaching special importance to the conduct of the Persian Government is that there have lately been five cases of gross incivility to our Consular officers. One in connection with the buildings at Kuhak and a second at Shiraz (see my despatches Nos. 237 and 243 of the 1st and 7th instant, respectively) I have already reported to your Lordship.

[1598]

2 B

I have the honour to remind your Lordship, in mitigation of the uncivil conduct of the Persian Government, that the King's Birthday fell this year in Ramazan, and as the bulk of the upper classes here spend their nights in orgies, it is probable that the Shah's Representative was sleeping off the effects of a carouse, and consequently forgot to do his duty.

I may add that the Grand Vizier and the Mushir-ed-Dowleh both called on me in the afternoon, and that the latter made profuse apologies for the discourtesy of the Asaph-es-Sultaneh.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 116.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

November 10, 1905.

I INFORMED the Persian Government officially and in writing that the 9th November was the Birthday of my August Sovereign, the King-Emperor. As is customary I awaited in uniform, accompanied by my staff, the arrival of a Representative from His Majesty the Shah between 11 A.M. and 1 P.M., the hours notified in my communication.

No person appeared on behalf of His Majesty. In these circumstances I have the honour to request your Excellency to favour me with an explanation of the neglect on the part of the Persian Government to observe the respect and courtesy due to His Majesty's Legation at the Court of Persia.

Inclosure 2 in No. 116.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

November 11, 1905.

WITH reference to your note of the 10th instant, stating that on the occasion of the Birthday of His Majesty the King of Great Britain no one called on the part of His Imperial Majesty the Shah to convey His Majesty's congratulations, I have the honour to inform you that I at once made inquiries. It appears that his Excellency the Asaph-es-Sultaneh was especially nominated by His Majesty the Shah to call at the British Legation, and to convey His Majesty's congratulations. On account of the Ramazan the Asaph-es-Sultaneh could not arrive in time, and he came a little too late and left a card.

I regret very much that the unpunctuality of the Asaph-es-Sultaneh should cause such a misconception as to the attitude of the Persian Government, and I must point out that the Persian Court has always had and will have regard for the perfect friendship existing between the two Governments.

Inclosure 3 in No. 116.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

November 13, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note of the 11th instant, in which you apologize for the discourtesy shown by the Asaph-es-Sultaneh to His Majesty's Legation on the occasion of the Birthday of His Majesty the King Emperor.

I shall not fail to forward a translation of your Excellency's note to His Majesty's Government, whom I have already informed by telegraph of the incident.

No. 117.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 248.)

Tehran, November 17, 1905.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the usual monthly summary of events in Persia which have not been recorded in separate despatches.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 117.

Monthly Summary of Events in Persia.

Meshed.

THE religious excitement at Meshed, aroused by recent events in the Caucasus, has apparently subsided, but the struggle with the Russians over their claim for an indemnity for damage done in the riots of the last Moharrem still continues. The Persians are taking up a strong attitude and have put in a counter-claim for the losses suffered by their people in the recent Baku disturbances. M. Somov, the Secretary of the Russian Legation, has returned to Tehran from Meshed without effecting anything, and the duel is apparently being continued here. The Persian Government have asked this Legation whether the Russians are paying anything for British losses at Baku, and Mr. Grant Duff has answered that though the Russian Government are not paying a direct indemnity, they are giving indirect assistance to the Companies which have suffered by loans on easy terms and facilities for acquiring new oil fields on Government property.

2. Small parties of Cossacks, said to be reliefs for various Consulates, keep arriving and departing from Meshed.

3. A plot of land has been bought for the purpose of starting a Russian school.

4. A room has been opened in the chief street of Meshed for the display of samples of Russian goods of every description.

4A. Rumours were current on the 6th November at Meshed of a mutiny among the Russian troops at Askabad, and that they had been joined by the civilian population. There was also a strike on the railway and the mails were interrupted.

5. It was recently reported in Meshed that the Reis-ut-Tujjar, who is also mentioned in connection with the rumours of the sale of the Seistan Crown lands, had sold his concession for the Meshed-Askabad road to the Russians. The truth of this is denied by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

6. The Persian Government have complained to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires of the recruiting of Berberis (tribesmen of Afghan stock) at Meshed, for service at Quetta. These men were apparently recruited and sent off with the authority of the Indian Government. His Majesty's Legation, with the exception of a few brief entries in Meshed and Seistan diaries, knows nothing of the matter, and has asked for an explanation.

Arabistan.

1. Major Morton, Vice-Consul at Ahwaz, has been on a tour of inspection along the Bakhtiari Road to Ispahan.

2. With regard to the grain embargo on the Karun, the whole question of the imposition of embargoes by the local authorities is forming the subject of correspondence between His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires and the Central Government.

Kerman.

1. The new Governor-General, the Zafar-es-Sultaneh, arrived on the 7th October.

2. Religious troubles between Sheikhs and Balasiris still continue. At the head of the Balasiri faction is a young Mullah, named Haji Mahommed Reza, who is regarded

with peculiar veneration. His followers on more than one occasion have shown an inclination to insult foreigners, though he has had the good sense not to encourage them. He was instructed from Kerbela to make peace with the Sheikhs, but the latest news from Kerman is that on the 26th October his followers started destroying liquor shops in the town, whereupon the new Governor-General sent troops against them. In the disturbances that ensued several people were killed and wounded, but the Mullah was taken, and on the following day bastinadoed and banished from the town.

3. The new Governor-General is endeavouring to shirk responsibility for robberies committed under his predecessor's tenure of office, but, owing to pressure brought by Mr. Grant Duff, has been instructed by the Central Government that he is liable. Mr. Grant Duff has also succeeded in inducing the Central Government to issue an order to the effect that in future responsibility will lie with the Governor of the district where the robbery is committed, the provenance of the robbers being immaterial.

Tabreez.

The Perso-Turkish frontier difficulty in the Soujhoulak district threatens to become serious. Relations between the Turkish Embassy in Tehran and the Persian Government are very strained, both on account of the present affair and of long outstanding claims and other grievances. The Embassy complain bitterly that they can get no satisfaction from the Persian in any of their cases and that the Porte takes no steps to strengthen their hands.

Shiraz.

1. The case of Agha Khan, the Jew claiming French nationality mentioned in previous summaries, continues to occupy the attention of the French and British Legations. The Karguzar has proved very troublesome in the matter and both Legations are taking a firm stand.

2. The Shoa-es-Sultaneh has passed through Tehran and has obtained the Shah's leave to go to Europe. Before leaving Shiraz he informed His Majesty's Consul that he intended going to Berlin for a cure, visiting Italy, returning to Persia by sea, visiting Egypt and Ceylon *en route*, disembarking at Calcutta, and crossing India by rail. He is suffering from stricture of the colon, syphilis, and epilepsy. Mr. Grant Duff has not called on him during his stay in Tehran, as a protest against his conduct of affairs in Fars. His horrible cruelty in recently causing the tongues of two innocent men to be torn out excited horror in Persia. One of the men died.

3. Fars is still in a chaotic condition, complaints of the insecurity of the roads reach the Legation by every post, and the Central Government seem to be unable or unwilling to do anything to remedy matters. (See despatch No. 237 of the 1st November.)

Ispahan.

The Zil-es-Sultan has passed through Tehran on his way to Europe. He had a very bad passage across the Caspian, and is believed to be now held up at Baku by the railway strike. He is travelling incognito with two of his sons and a few servants, but Mr. Grant Duff has telegraphed to the Foreign Office suggesting that, if possible, civility be shown to him. It is considered improbable that he will be permitted to visit London.

Siestan.

1. There has been considerable excitement in Nasretabad over the desire of the Russian Consulate to acquire a Mahomedan graveyard, which, as it lay in front of their gate, the Russians wished to inclose and gradually alter so as to make it less of an eyesore. The Karguzar has been working for the Russians in the matter, but it has raised a storm of indignation among the Mullahs; the Karguzar, who is consistently in favour of the Russians, has taken the opportunity of insinuating that the British Consulate also had an eye on this Naboth's vineyard.

2. Two cases, in one of which British subjects, and in the other a native assistant of the Consulate were implicated, have led to a passage of arms between the

Karguzar and His Majesty's Consul. A very discourteous letter was addressed by the Karguzar to Captain Macpherson, who forwarded it at once to Tehran. Mr. Grant Duff is demanding the man's dismissal, and has spoken very strongly to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh as to recent instances which have been brought to his notice of discourtesy on the part of Persian officials to His Majesty's Consular officers.

(Signed) G. JARDINE KIDSTON.

Tehran News.

His Imperial Highness the Valiahd left on Tuesday, the 17th October, for Tabreez. On the preceding Sunday Mr. Grant Duff paid his Highness a farewell visit and had a cordial reception. During their conversation, which lasted about three-quarters of an hour, political subjects were avoided, with the exception of the Urmi case and the condition of Fars. Mr. Grant Duff urged his Highness to lend his powerful assistance to bring the former to a satisfactory conclusion. His Highness promised to do all he could to help His Majesty's Legation in the matter, but will doubtless work hard to save the Kurds from punishment. As regards Fars, the Valiahd hates his brother the Shoa-es-Sultaneh, the present Governor-General of that province, and may perhaps exert his influence to put an end to the prevailing anarchy. His Highness said he had already spoken seriously to the Shah regarding the chaos existing in Fars, but would, before leaving, again bring the matter to His Majesty's notice.

2. The Grand Vizier is stated to be leaving at an early date on a pilgrimage to Meshed, where he will only remain a few days.

3. The Hashmet-ul Mulk, Amir of Seistan, is still in Tehran, and pressure is being brought to bear on him to pay the British outstanding claims in his province. The Hashmet-ul Mulk recently asked Mr. Grant Duff to guarantee a further loan from the Imperial Bank of Persia. In view of the instructions given by Lord Lansdowne to Sir A. Hardinge on the subject, Mr. Grant Duff declined to accede to his request.

4. The Zil-es-Sultan has passed through Tehran. Mr. Grant Duff, accompanied by the Legation staff, called on his Imperial Highness. The Prince returned his visit a few days later. Both visits were marked by the greatest cordiality. The Zil-es-Sultan's health appears to be bad, and his visit to Europe is chiefly undertaken in order to undergo a cure. His sons, Bahrām Mirza and Akber Mirza, travel with him.

5. Mr. Naus has been in Vienna, and is reported to have met there Ali Asghar Khan, formerly Atabeg-i Azam.

Matters dealt with in separate Despatches.

Matters dealt with.	No. and Date of Despatch.
Arms for Munich Consulate-General	No. 238 of November 3, and No. 241 of November 6, 1905.
Hongkong telegraph buildings	No. 225 of October 16, and No. 252 of November 6, 1905.
Russian mission Jullie to Tabreez	No. 227 of October 18, 1905.
Special representation of India at Tehran ..	No. 228 of October 21, 1905.
Military review at Tehran	No. 229 of October 30, 1905.
The Shoa-es-Sultaneh	No. 230, Confidential, of November 1, 1905.
British in the insecurity of	No. 251 of November 2, and No. 246 of November 3, 1905.
Looting of and property by foreigners in Persia ..	No. 255 of November 4, 1905.
Consular dispute	No. 236 of November 4, and No. 12 of November 7, 1905.
Provision of for the of	No. 237 of November 4, 1905.
.. .. of of	No. 238, Confidential, of November 6, 1905.
..	No. 239 of November 6, 1905.
..	No. 243 of November 7, 1905.
..	No. 244 of November 7, 1905.

November 7, 1905.

No. 118.

Mr. Spring-Rice to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 740.)

My Lord,

St. Petersburg, December 11, 1905.

WITH reference to Sir Charles Hardinge's despatch No. 640 of the 26th October, I have the honour to inform your Lordship that early this month the "Novoe Vremya" published an article accusing the Russian Foreign Office of excessive zeal on behalf of the British capitalists interested in the oil wells at Baku who suffered from the disorders in that town. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs has published a communiqué denying the charge, and explaining the action actually taken in the matter, which I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith.*

I have, &c.
(Signed) CECIL SPRING-RICE.

No. 119.

Mr. Spring-Rice to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 744.)

My Lord,

St. Petersburg, December 12, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 740 of yesterday's date, and previous correspondence relative to the claim of the British Companies who were losers in consequence of the Baku disorders, I have the honour to inform your Lordship that I have been informed by the gentlemen in charge of their interests here (who is now proceeding to England) that the Baku Oil Companies have come to an arrangement with the Minister of Finance with regard to the grant of an advance from Imperial funds. The total amount to be advanced is fixed at 20,000,000 roubles (2,000,000 £). Of this amount the Baku Russian Petroleum Company, the Russian Petroleum and Liquid Fuel Company, and the Shibaiev Company will receive altogether about 200,000 £, distributed in, roughly speaking, equal proportions. The terms are as follows: Interest to be at the rate of 5½ per cent., and the capital to be repaid by a percentage charge on the output which in some cases would be equivalent to repayment of the whole sum due in three or four years. In view of the agitation with regard to the supposed favours accorded to foreign shareholders, allusion to which is made in my despatch above mentioned, I do not think it advisable to approach the Russian Government, at any rate for the present, with a view to obtaining discriminatory treatment for British capital.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CECIL SPRING-RICE.

No. 120.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 16.)

(No. 476.)

(Telegraphic.)—P.

Tehran, December 16, 1905.

THE following telegram has been sent to Government of India:—

"My telegram No. 464 of the 1st instant

"Grand Vizier informed me yesterday that he will be compelled to accept loan from Russia on very severe terms unless His Majesty's Government will make an advance, and begged me for an early reply. I cannot say for certain whether he is speaking the truth, but think it unlikely that at the present juncture the Russian Government will offer a large loan.

"Atabeg may fail if he be unable to raise money, and, as there is no other probable candidate, the former Grand Vizier, who was Russophil, may return. Present

* Not printed.

Grand Vizier is generally anti-foreign, but is, I think, better disposed to us than to the Russians.

"I have succeeded with great difficulty in obtaining from his Highness a paper countersigned by the Shah, agreeing to pay to the Imperial Bank of Persia in two months the sum of 750,000 tomans. Directors, at meeting to-day, will thus be spared an unpleasant interview with shareholders."

No. 121.

Sir N. O'Connor to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 18.)

(No. 914.)

Sir,

Constantinople, December 12, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Turco-Persian frontier difficulty, referred to in my despatch to Lord Lansdowne No. 721 of the 17th October last, so far from having been satisfactorily disposed of, appears to be entering upon a more acute phase.

Each side accuses the other of being in military occupation of territory which either belongs to itself or else, in accordance with existing Agreements, should be treated as neutral, and while the Persians are said to be threatening a Turkish post, established at Pessweh, with a miscellaneous force of five or six thousand men, the Turks on their side are hastily dispatching reinforcements, provided with artillery, towards the disputed points.

Telegrams received this morning from His Majesty's Consular Representatives at Bitlis and Diarbekir show that orders have been issued for the dispatch of both regular infantry and Hamidiéh cavalry to the Persian frontier, while rumours current here this afternoon speak of the mobilization of a considerable portion of the Fourth Army Corps.

The Persian Ambassador, who called upon me about a month ago to discuss this question, informed me that he was urging the Porte to withdraw its troops from the positions, which his Government asserted to have been illegally occupied, pending the dispatch of a Mixed Commission to investigate on the spot the points in dispute. It was then agreed that, if he failed to obtain the assent of the Ottoman Government to these proposals, he should lay a written statement of the case before the Russian Ambassador and myself, and solicit our good offices to bring about a settlement in virtue of the Agreement of March 1865, cited in my above-mentioned despatch. I assured him that, when he did so, I would give the matter my most careful consideration, and should be very pleased, if it should prove to be in my power, to promote an amicable arrangement.

I understood that the Council of Ministers, to which the matter was then referred, reported in favour of appointing a Commission in accordance with the Persian demands, but that the Sultan rejected their recommendation and instructed the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to draw up a Report, embodying the conclusions arrived at by a Commission which sat at that Department in 1892, to serve as a basis for a fresh deliberation by the Council.

A special Council of Ministers, which was summoned to meet this afternoon at the Palace, is believed to have been occupied in the consideration of this question.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. H. O'CONNOR.

No. 122.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 18.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 18th December, relative to arms for the Meshed and Seistan Consulates.

India Office, December 18, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 122.

Government of India to Mr. Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P.

December 18, 1905.

PLEASE refer to the telegram of the 13th instant from *Chargé d'Affaires*, as to the outbreak at Tehran. Having regard to possible spread of disturbances from Tehran to Seistan and Meshed, we would request permission to send to Koh-i-Malik Siah arms for our Consulates. It takes nearly two months to convey arms to Meshed from Quetta; if stored at Koh-i-Malik Siah, they would be available at shorter notice for distribution, if and when His Majesty's Government decide that this step is necessary. (Repeated to Tehran.)

No. 123.

Sir N. O'Connor to Sir Edward Grey. — (Received December 18.)

(No. 214.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, December 18, 1905.

QUESTION of Russo-Persian frontier.

OTTOMAN Government, while refusing to withdraw troops from territory in dispute, agrees to appointment of a mixed Commission. I think that Persian Government, if they accepted this arrangement, would be acting wisely.

Forces on the frontier have been considerably strengthened, and a conflict may easily follow if present situation is prolonged. The Russian Ambassador, who is telegraphing to St. Petersburg in the same sense, and I have both given the Persian Ambassador the same advice.

(Tehran informed.)

No. 124.

India Office to Foreign Office. — (Received December 19.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 23rd November, relative to the Seistan Water Award and Russo-Afghan relations.

India Office, December 19, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 124.

The Amere of Afghanistan to Government of India.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

11th Raman, 1323 Hija (November 2, 1905).

I TROUBLE your Excellency with a view to letting your Excellency know that I have written several times about the behaviour of the Russian Government, with which your Excellency's Government may be acquainted and familiar. Now, again, I inform your Excellency's Government that in these days I notice that the behaviour of the Russian Government on the frontiers of the God-granted Government of Afghanistan is changed. For instance, on the 22nd Rajab, 1323 Hija, corresponding to the 22nd September, 1905, A.D., an officer in the service of the Russian Government crossed the frontier of the God-granted Government of Afghanistan at Putri Kisar with an interpreter, and asked to be allowed to go to Mazar-i-Sharif to visit the Governor of that place. The frontier officers of my Government prevented them from going to Mazar-i-Sharif, whereupon they returned. It is not known what their object was in making this request and move.

I have also received a Petition from the Governor and the Commander-in-chief of Herat servants of my Government, in which they have reported particulars of the conduct of the servants of the Russian Government. I send their letter, in original,

for your Excellency's information, so that your Excellency may become fully acquainted with its contents.

With regard to the Award of the settlement of the question of the irrigation of the "Naizar" of Seistan, belonging to the God-granted Government of Afghanistan and the Government of Persia, Colonel McMahon was appointed and deputed by the British Government to that frontier. He took much trouble and pains; and, after being occupied in that work for a long time, he completed his task of arbitration in the matter of the settlement of the irrigation question, and submitted his Award to his Government with a view to leaving no defect whatever. Your Excellency's Government communicated his Award to me for acceptance on the 19th Safar, 1323 Hija, corresponding to the 25th April, 1905, A.D., and all the matters contained in it, as proposed and settled and decided by the arbitration of Colonel McMahon were entirely approved and accepted by me, with the exception of clause 5 of the Award, which I was unable to approve and accept, as I noticed a defect in it, the particulars of which I communicated to your Excellency in writing, with the remark that the question of the irrigation of the said border having now been thoroughly settled through the labours, endeavours, and efforts of the Arbitrator appointed by the British Government, if any dispute about it should arise hereafter, it would be the work of an instigator. What I said and thought then has come to pass, as I have received a letter from Ghulam Ahmad Khan, a Military Brigadier, and one of the servants of the Government of Afghanistan employed on that frontier, which I send for your Excellency's perusal and information, in original, together with a letter from Abdul Hamid Khan, the Frontier Officer of the Persian Government, to the address of the said Brigadier, saying that the Persian Government dispute the settlement of the irrigation question, and have not accepted the Award. I have instructed the said Brigadier to send the following reply from himself to the Persian Frontier Officer:—

"I will not send men to make the 'band' (dam) without the orders or permission of my King, because the question of the distribution of water was settled by Colonel McMahon, the Arbitrator appointed by the British Government. I shall submit your letter to my King, and shall act in accordance with any orders that I may receive from him. Now that you have transgressed that principle and do not accept that arbitration Award, and wish to act in contravention of it, we shall wait for orders from our King and then assert and obtain our rights in every way."

I therefore write to your Excellency to say that, if your Excellency's Government has already received information and taken steps to put a stop to such behaviour on their part well and good, information to that effect may be sent to me; otherwise, whatever steps your Excellency may take, on becoming acquainted with their behaviour from my letters, I may be informed thereof. It is evident that the instigators of this action are the Russian Government; otherwise, how can it be that the Commissioner and Arbitrator appointed by the British Government should settle the question after taking so much trouble, and give his Award in communication with his Government, who should approve it and appreciate his good service in the matter, and that the settlement should be set aside after such a short time. It is, indeed, a matter for great regret and surprise. I write these particulars in a friendly way for the information of your Excellency's Government, so that they may become acquainted with the behaviour of the Russian Government on the frontiers of the God-granted Government of Afghanistan.

Inclosure 2 in No. 124.

Governor and Commander-in-chief of Herat to the Amere of Afghanistan.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

14th Shalwa, 1323 Hija (October 4, 1905).

WE have received a letter from Sarhang Mahmud Khan from Chihil Dukhteran, in which he reports as follows:—

"I sent Khassadar Mulla Musalli to Tappura to obtain news. He has returned, and reports that the Russian telegraph line has been extended from Tappura to Kara Tappasi-Bala, and connected with the new Russian guard-house there, which is situated near the border, and that three houses and a brick kiln have been built at a place in Russian territory situated at a distance of a gunshot from the Khassadar's entombment."

1505

2 D

"A Turkoman interpreter was sent to me by the Captain Commanding the Russian Guards opposite Chihil Dukhteran the other day to ask for some eggs, which, he said, were required for a guest of the Captain. I said to him, 'You yourselves possess fowls.' He replied, 'Our fowls do not lay eggs.' I told him, 'It is the season of Tirmah (autumn) now. Our fowls also do not lay eggs.' Thereupon he went back.

"A tent has been pitched in the rear of the Russian guard-house to-day (30th September, 1905). There was no tent at this place before. Mulla Masalli reports that sixty Russian infantry soldiers have carried back to Tannra the telegraph poles which remained over after the completion of the line to the guard-house.

"I had told off Duffadar Patch Muhammad Khan, Trooper Pir, Muhammad, and Khassadars Ahmad and Amir Muhammad to patrol the frontier at night, with instructions to return to camp in the morning. They went on Thursday night, and when they were returning on Friday morning they saw a Russian soldier with a rifle in his hand at a distance of a gunshot and-a-half from the border. As this Russian soldier was coming forward to enter Afghan territory, the Duffadar, who was in front with the cavalryman, shouted out to him, 'Where are you going?' Thereupon the Russian in question called some of his companions, who were further away, and whom the Duffadar had not seen, and they instantly fired a volley on the Duffadar. The Duffadar and the cavalryman fled, but the two Khassadars remained behind. The Russian soldiers then fired on the Khassadars. Khassadar Ahmad also fled, but Amir Muhammad remained. When the Duffadar and the cavalryman and Khassadar Ahmad told me on their arrival in camp what had happened, I sent the Duffadar back, with Ata Muhammad, Nurzal, and Muhammad Aman. They found Amir Muhammad, Khassadar, killed and his rifle carried off. They saw four Russians going towards Russian territory with two dogs. One of them had a black beard and three had grey beards.

"Seven flags are said to have been put up opposite Shur Araba on the border line. There were no flags at this place before."

We have sent instructions to Sarhang Mahmud Khan to depute a trustworthy agent to Sheikh Junnid and Panjleh to find out if such deeds are committed by the Russians with the permission of the officers of their Government, or whether they are the outcome of the political designs and trickery of their frontier officers, what object they have in view in pitching a new tent, and what reports are current among them about the Japanese war. When a complete report has been received it will be submitted to your Highness. With regard to the murder of Amir Muhammad, Khassadar, and the boldness and insolence displayed by the Russians, we solicit orders, which we will carry out.

We pray for instructions on the subject of the murder of Amir Muhammad, Khassadar, the violation of the border by the Russians, and their fearlessness. Should we communicate with the Russians about it, and ask them to pay compensation and to refrain from overstepping their border-line, or do something else? We ask for an early reply and instructions about the matter in question. We shall submit to your Majesty any news-letter that we receive through Sarhang Mahmud Khan.

Inclosure 3 in No. 124.

Gulam Ahmad, Brigadier of the Faruk troops, to the Amir of Afghanistan.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

19th Rajab, 1323 Hijra (September 20, 1905).

I HAVE received a letter from Abdul Hamid Khan, the Frontier Officer of Seistan, which I submit in original to your Majesty. It appears from his letter that either the question of the distribution of water has not yet been settled, or that the Persian Government have not accepted the Award given by Colonel McMahon, Chief Officer of the British Commission, regarding the distribution of water, since he (the Persian Frontier Officer) has written such a letter.

Akhundzada Fakir Muhammad is now with your Majesty with the maps of the demarcation and water distribution.

Your Majesty can ascertain from him whether the maps of the settlement of Colonel McMahon are accepted and signed by officers of the Persian Government or not. Your Majesty will then know the facts. I venture to represent that disputes arise daily about water, and full instructions are needed.

Inclosure 4 in No. 124.

Abdul Hamid Khan, Ghaffari, Frontier Officer and Commissioner of the Persian Government, to Brigadier Ghulam Ahmad Khan.

(Translation.)

(After compliments.)

16th Rajab, 1323 Hijra (September 17, 1905).

IN order that the Helmand River, which is called the Nad-i-Ali Channel from Band-i-Pariun towards the north, may draw more water than usual which may be sufficient for irrigation of both sides, the rightful Persian officials of Miankaugi are sending labourers to widen that channel. Will you, in your capacity of partners, please send labourers from your side also, if you consider it advisable to co-operate with our men, so that plenty of water may be available at the time of "nasaq" [i.e., the constellation Orion, meaning autumn irrigation].

The Water Award of Colonel McMahon, the Chief of the last British Commission, has not at all been accepted by the Persian Government, and water sufficient for the needs and requirements of their existing cultivation will be taken by both sides in accordance with the former Award given by General Goldsmid, the Chief of the first Commission, pending the result of the discussion which is now going on about the last Award. I trouble you with this letter for your information.

No. 125.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 19.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 18th December, relative to the Meshed-Seistan telegraph line.

India Office, December 19, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 125.

Government of India to Mr. Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P.

December 18, 1905.

PLEASE refer to the telegram of the 9th instant from Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran regarding the Meshed-Seistan telegraph.

Joint execution of repairs by British and Russian parties was first proposed by Macpherson, but we agree with Grant Duff (with whom Macpherson concurs) that it would be preferable to attempt to secure division of line for purposes of repairs; and our interests will be well protected if dividing point is fixed between Kain and Turbat-i-Haidari, or half-way between Koh-i-Malik Siah and Ashabad. If Persian Government object to this, we could press for adoption of system of joint repairs; and if, in spite of their repeated assurances, culminating in the definite pledge given in May last to Sir A. Hardinge by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, Persian Government reject this proposal also, and, at the same time, refuse us permission to make the Robat Nasratabad connection, this will be clear revelation of their unfriendly attitude, and will strengthen the case for the adoption of more energetic measures in order to prevent Russia from absorbing Seistan.

No. 126.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 172.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 20, 1905.

I HAVE received your despatch No. 237 of the 1st ultimo, reporting upon the disturbed condition of the province of Fars.

The terms of the note addressed by you to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh with regard to the maltreatment of a witness at Shiraz have my approval.

I am, &c.

(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

India Office to Foreign Office.—Received December 21.)

Sir,

India Office, December 20, 1905.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Morley to inclose, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a copy of a letter from the Government of India on the subject of the Sepoy guards for the British Consulates in Persia.*

It will be seen that the increased cost of the revised establishments as compared with those which existed in May 1903, is estimated at rupees 31,317 : 7 : 10 for initial expenditure, and at 1,16,500 rupees for annually recurring expenditure.

Subject to Sir E. Grey's concurrence, Mr. Morley proposes to instruct the Government of India to include the additional cost, as it is incurred, in the annual statements of increases and decreases of expenditure on Persian establishments, and to treat in the same manner the whole cost of the Consular guards in Persia, instead of making separate periodical claims on this account, as has hitherto been the practice.

As the next annual statement is now under preparation in India, Mr. Morley will be glad to be favoured with Sir E. Grey's views at an early date.

With regard to the measures proposed by the Military Attaché at Tehran for the improvement of the discipline of the Consular guards, Mr. Morley concurs in the conclusions of the Government of India.

I have &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Grant Duff.

(No. 173.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 21, 1905.

I HAVE received your despatch No. 242 of the 7th ultimo, addressed to my predecessor, reporting a conversation with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh relative to Persian claims for losses suffered during the recent disturbances at Baku.

I approve your language to his Excellency on this occasion.

I transmit herewith, for your information, copies of two despatches from His Majesty's Charge d'Affaires at St. Petersburg on the subject of the indirect compensation granted by the Russian Government to British Oil Companies at Baku.†

I am, &c.
(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 22.)

(No. 178.)

(Telegraphic.) C.

Tehran, December 22, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to Government of India:—

"Situation in Pers, according to latest report from His Majesty's Consul at Shiraz, is very serious. I have dispatched an urgent note to the Grand Vizier, representing that a crisis detrimental to British interests may ensue if the present Governor-General, who is the Shah's second son, be retained. Guards on the road recently stopped and beat messengers of His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire. I am of opinion that we should shortly officially demand recall of Governor-General. Our relations with Valialah would thereby be improved, as His Royal Highness imagined till lately that Shouss-Sultaneh, whom he hates, was receiving our support. I propose to instruct His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire if possible to send up Indian infantry guard, in case of renewal of disturbances at Shiraz."

* No. 1149.

† Nos. 118 and 142.

Foreign Office to Persian Transport Company.

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 22, 1905.

SECRETARY Sir E. Grey has been informed by Sir A. Hardinge that you have recently been in communication with him in regard to the question of the direction to be taken by your new road from Kum to Ispahan.

It is understood that there are three alternative routes:—

1. The easternmost, from Kum viâ Kashan and Natanz.
2. The central, viâ Kashan over Kohrid Pass.
3. The western, or Naizar route, avoiding Kashan and following the Kum-Sultanabad route as far as Anayetbeg, and thence due south to Ispahan.

It appears that your Company desire, for the present at least, to make the third of these routes their main route between Kum and Ispahan. The objection, however, to this course lies in the fact that the Persian Government might contend that you held a Concession to build one road, but not two, between Kum and Ispahan, and that they might demand extra payments for the privilege.

In order to meet this possible objection it is suggested that, as your Concession provides for a Kum-Ispahan and for a Burujird-Ispahan as well as for a Kum-Sultanabad road, the Ispahan-Burujird road should be made to run viâ Dodagh, Anayetbeg, and Sultanabad, and the Kum-Ispahan road viâ Kashan and either Kohrid or Natanz, as may be considered most convenient. If the Persian Government object on the ground that the Anayetbeg-Ispahan road is really the Kum-Ispahan road, it can be pointed out that this is not the case, that the natural road from Kum to Ispahan is through Kashan, and that the Naizar route is merely the carrying out of the Burujird-Ispahan branch of the Concession, which leaves you perfectly free to develop the regular Kum-Ispahan route through Kashan.

It is understood that your Company desire to be assured that His Majesty's Government concur in this suggestion, and will support them in the above interpretation of their Concession.

I am directed by Sir E. Grey to inform you that His Majesty's Government are prepared to give you an assurance to this effect.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 130.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 22.)

(No. 179.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 22, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to Government of India:—

"Critical situation may, in my opinion, possibly arise in Persia, where dissatisfaction with Shah and his Ministers is widespread, and daily increasing, if disturbances in Russia continue and massacres of Mussulmans in the Caucasus are not suppressed.

"People no longer afraid of Russian occupation of northern towns in the event of anti-Christian disturbances, which formerly checked any fanatical movement.

"I think that Legation guard should be increased to fifty men if situation in Russia is likely to continue.

"There has been no direct postal service for several weeks, and no news of present state of things has been received by the Russian Legation.

"Although I have no desire to be alarmist, I think that we should carefully consider and provide against possibility of disturbances in Tehran and elsewhere in Persia. It is probable that Armenians and most of foreigners here would take refuge in His Majesty's Legation. Though there is no trouble here at present, the principal Mullahs have gone to a shrine near the town, and refuse to return."

No. 131.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 250.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 2, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copies of correspondence relating to the recruiting of Berberis or Hazaras by His Majesty's Consul-General in Khorassan for service in regiments in British Baluchistan.

Although I find, on looking through the back numbers of the diaries of the Consulate-General at Meshed, a few casual references to the recruiting of Berberis who are Persian subjects, my attention was only seriously called to the matter by the note from the Persian Government translation of which I inclose.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh informed me verbally that the Shah had been annoyed by the action of His Majesty's Consul-General, and had inquired by what right His Majesty's Government recruited soldiers in Persia. At the time his Excellency spoke to me I knew practically nothing of the matter, but, after inquiries, I addressed a note to the Persian Government to the effect that the proceedings of Major Sykes had not been sanctioned by me, and that orders had now been sent to him to disband the Berberis already collected at Meshed and to desist from further recruiting. As the Mushir-ed-Dowleh has not again reverted to the subject, I hope that the Persian Government are satisfied, but it appears to me unfortunate that such incidents should be allowed to happen. I wish to draw your Lordship's attention to the fact that this questionable proceeding on the part of the Consulate-General in Khorassan was apparently the result of direct instructions from the Government of India, who, for reasons of which I am unaware, neglected to consult His Majesty's Legation. I cannot think that it is to the public interest that Consular officers in Persia should be permitted to initiate and carry out measures, even when unobjectionable, without the British Representative at Tehran being formally consulted.

If, as I trust, your Lordship agrees with this view, I venture to suggest that a copy of the inclosed correspondence should be laid before the Secretary of State for India.

I have, &c.

(Signed)

EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 131.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

October 25, 1905.

REPORTS have reached me that the British Consul-General at Meshed is sending away the Berberis (Hazaras) who have for some time past resided in Persia, and who hold landed property in this country.

I have the honour to inquire from you whether this report is true. If so, I have to draw your attention to the importance of this measure, which the Persian Government never expected from the British officials, whose duty it is to strengthen the friendly relations between the two Powers, and I expect you to use your good offices in putting a stop to this unexpected measure.

Inclosure 2 in No. 131.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Vice-Consul Battye.

(No. 71.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

October 26, 1905.

I HAVE received a complaint from the Persian Government to the effect that you are sending Hazaras and Berberis away from Meshed. Please report facts.

Inclosure 3 in No. 131.

Vice-Consul Battye to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 15.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Meshed, October 30, 1905.

BERBERIS. Your telegram No. 71.

A comparatively small number of Berberis, who offered to take service with the Government at Quetta, have, with the permission of the Indian Government, been sent to India.

I am reporting by despatch. The Berberi agent who arranged for the recruiting of these men has now left Meshed.

Inclosure 4 in No. 131.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Government of India.

(No. 192.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

October 31, 1905.

I HAVE received a complaint from the Persian Government to the effect that Berberis have been enlisted and sent out of Persia by Consul-General at Meshed. Major Sykes states that he had the permission of the Indian Government to do this.

Are these Berberis British subjects? If they are not, I think it regrettable that the matter was not first laid before the Legation. The Persian Government is greatly annoyed by such incidents, and the difficulties here, which are already quite numerous enough, are materially increased thereby.

Inclosure 5 in No. 131.

Vice-Consul Battye to Government of India.

(No. 93.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Meshed, November 11, 1905.

FOLLOWING extract from a letter from Consul-General in camp at Karez:—

"I would suggest the speedy return of the native officer to India, as he cannot obtain a single Berberi recruit in the villages, and the Persian Government are objecting to our action.

This officer is now awaiting instructions at Turbat. The recruits now here, ready to start, number about sixteen, and could be sent in two parties to India.

I should be glad to receive instructions by telegram.

(Addressed to Government of India and repeated to Tehran.)

Inclosure 6 in No. 131.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Government of India.

(No. 203.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 11, 1905.

MESHED telegram of 11th November.

I await answer to my telegram of 31st October.

The matter has caused much annoyance to the Persian Government, and until I receive particulars I cannot take action.

I decline in the present case to be responsible for the action of His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed, which was taken without my instructions, and I think it most undesirable that recruiting should be allowed to take place in Persia without first consulting the Legation.

(Repeated to Meshed.)

Inclosure 7 in No. 131.

Vice-Consul Battye to Government of India.

(No. 96.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Meshed, November 15, 1905.

IN continuation of my telegram No. 92 of 6th November.

The Berberi native recruiting officer was introduced to Sir A. Hardinge when he was here last September and the object of his visit explained.

References to the matter in the weekly diaries had already been seen by Sir A. Hardinge.

(Repeated to Tehran.)

Inclosure 8 in No. 131.

Government of India to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 15, 1905.

IN reply to your telegram of 31st October, the Indian Government regret that reference was not made to the Legation before approving the scheme for recruiting Berberis for the Indian army. It was on Minchin's advice that measure was sanctioned as an experiment, but it was understood that recruiting would be quietly carried out and the men sent down to Quetta in batches of two and three. Instructions are being sent to Sykes to disband the sixteen recruits now at Meshed, to send the recruiting officer back to India, and to desist from further recruiting of men of this class.

(Repeated to Meshed.)

Inclosure 9 in No. 131.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

November 15, 1905.

ON the receipt of your note of the 25th ultimo I at once made inquiries regarding the alleged removing from Persia of Berberis by His Majesty's Consul-General at Meshed. It appears that the report is true, but I wish to assure your Excellency that the removing of these people was carried out without my sanction. Orders have now been sent to Major Sykes at once to desist from the action complained of by your Excellency, and the sixteen Berberis who have been collected at Meshed will be immediately disbanded.

I trust, therefore, that this matter will cause no further trouble to the Persian Government.

[Inclosure 10 in No. 131.]

Vice-Consul Battye to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 95.)

Sir,

Meshed, November 13, 1905.

IN continuation of my telegram No. 15 of the 28th October last, and under instructions from Major P. M. Sykes, I have the honour to forward to you herewith copies of correspondence which took place between Colonel Minchin, late Consul-General here, and the Government of India regarding the recruitment of Hazaras or Berberis in Khorassan for regiments in Baluchistan.

The correspondence includes—

1. A demi-official letter from Colonel Minchin to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, dated the 3rd December, 1904.
2. A letter from the same to Major Walters, dated the 2nd December, 1904.
3. An official letter from the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department to Colonel Minchin, dated the 21st February, 1905.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. R. BATTYE.

[Inclosure 11 in No. 131.]

Consul-General Minchin to Government of India.

December 3, 1904.

My dear Clarke,

I INCLOSE, for the information of the Foreign Department, a copy of letters I have dispatched by to-day's post to Major Walters, 124th Baluchistan Infantry (now with the Seistan Arbitration Commission), and to Colonel Jacob, 106th Hazara Pioneers, at Quetta, regarding the enlistment of Hazaras in Khorassan.

Should the Foreign Department consider that the enlistment of Hazaras is, for political reasons, not at present advisable in Khorassan, will you kindly inform the military authorities accordingly, before either of the regiments concerned make arrangements to recruit in these parts.

I do not personally see any objection to it provided it is done quietly and tactfully, and this Agency is aware of all that is being done.

Yours, &c.

(Signed) C. MINCHIN.

[Inclosure 12 in No. 131.]

Consul-General Minchin to Major Walters.

December 2, 1904.

Dear Walters,

I AM afraid I have been a long time answering your letter of the 10th October regarding Hazara Pioneers.

I have been making inquiries here, and the conclusion I have arrived at is that any number of Hazaras are available for enlistment in these parts; also that, if land was granted to them in Baluchistan, they would take their families with them, and probably settle down there. Several men who have already done service in our regiments (and consequently know what they are talking about) have expressed their willingness to do this.

To find a Hazara of any standing who can bring recruits is difficult. There do not seem to be any such men in these parts who would be likely to enlist; they seem to be all men of the Sepoy class.

As regards recruiting here, the best way, I should say, would be to send a picked Hazara native officer, or non-commissioned officer, to report himself to this Consulate. We would help him in any possible way, and our doctor would medically inspect the men. He would have to send his recruits down quietly in small batches of two and three at a time. A regular recruiting party, or open recruiting, would most certainly excite the suspicion of the Persian authorities.

At the same time, I am inclined to think that, unless Colonel Yates' scheme of settling them down in Baluchistan were carried out, and the men were induced to take their families with them, there would not be much hope of men from these parts serving for any length of time. They all seem to want to drift back here after a time.

Colonel Jacob, 106th Hazara Pioneers, has also written to me on this subject, and I am answering him in the same sense.

Yours, &c.

(Signed) C. MINCHIN.

[Inclosure 13 in No. 131.]

Government of India to Consul-General Minchin.

(Confidential.)

Fort William, February 21, 1905.

Sir,

I AM directed to address you on the subject of the recruitment for the Indian army of Hazaras residing in Khorassan.

It is understood that a large number of Hazaras are available in Khorassan for enlistment, and that you see no objection to this source being tapped provided that it is done tactfully and quietly, and with the full cognizance of the Meshed Consulate-General. The Government of India agree in this view, and it has been accordingly decided to send to Meshed, as an experimental measure, a picked Hazara native officer, or non-commissioned officer, to commence recruiting. He will report himself to you, and will be instructed to act exactly in accordance with the instructions and advice which you may give him. I am to request you to afford all facilities to the officer who may be deputed for this duty, and arrange for professional examination by the medical officer of the Khorassan Agency of any recruits who may be desirous of enlisting.

I have, &c.

(Signed) E. CLARKE,

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India.

No. 132.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 251.)

Tehran, December 2, 1905.

My Lord,

IN obedience to the instructions contained in your Lordship's despatch No. 145 of the 11th October last, I have the honour to inclose a copy of a note which I have addressed to the Persian Government, stating that His Majesty's Government would be unable to withdraw the Legation or Consular sowars from Persia, even if the Russian Government agreed to withdraw their Cossack guards.

[Inclosure in No. 132.]

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Your Excellency,

Tehran, November 30, 1905.

IN the course of a conversation which I had the honour to have with you on the 30th August last, your Excellency inquired whether, if the Russian Government consented to withdraw their various Cossack guards from Persia, His Majesty's Government would also sanction the withdrawal of the Legation and Consulate sowars.

At your Excellency's request I at once telegraphed to the Marquess of Lansdowne in the above sense, and I am now instructed to inform your Excellency that, in his Lordship's opinion, the position of Russia in the matter differs essentially from that of Great Britain, owing to the presence of the Cossack brigade at Tehran, and that His Majesty's Government are unable to entertain the proposal of the Persian Government that the Indian sowars should be withdrawn.

I have, &c.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 252. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 2, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inclose an interesting Memorandum by Abbas Kuli Khan, Acting Oriental Secretary of this Legation, of a conversation he recently had with the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

I think there is no doubt that the Mushir-ed-Dowleh's views are substantially correct. The fact that the Mollahs of Tehran should dare, in broad daylight, to destroy an office of the Russian Bank situated in the bazaar is a significant sign of the times. It is also highly unlikely that the starving soldiery will be enthusiastic in their defence of a Government which furnishes them with little food and practically no money.

The continuance in office of the present Grand Vizier depends, I think, largely on whether or not he succeeds in obtaining a substantial loan from either Great Britain or Russia. Although hopelessly obstinate and utterly ignorant of all knowledge of the sound principles of administration, I think he is less unfriendly to us than to the Russians, and in a way has some feelings of patriotism and of the necessity for reforms. But he is terribly handicapped by the Shah, who is the great obstacle to all possible progress in this country. His Majesty, whose character and habits are well known to your Lordship, lives surrounded by the most ignoble favourites, and listens to their advice in preference to that of his responsible and relatively respectable Ministers. Were there any kind of unity among the people of Persia, the Shah and the Kajar clan would long ago have been murdered or expelled; but such is the general apathy created by generations of oppression that a state of practical anarchy continues to exist, such as would be, I think, impossible in any other country in the world.

How long Persia will remain in this condition it is impossible to say, but I feel it my duty to warn your Lordship that I think the situation is becoming daily more serious. Nasr-ul-Mulk, who was four years at Balliol College under Dr. Jowett, and who is now Minister of Finance, told me confidentially yesterday that the finances were in utter confusion and that he was trying to do what he could to organize some system of keeping accounts. He spoke in the most gloomy way of the prospects of his country, of the utter corruption of the officials, and of the gradual weakening of the hold of the Central Government on the provinces. He said that there is only one word to describe the situation, and that is "chaos."

Without some sort of European control of the finances nothing can, in my opinion, save Persia from bankruptcy. To lend this Government money while the present Shah continues to reign is merely putting off the evil day. Such money is spent on musical boxes, electric trains, and on favourites to whom I will not shock your Lordship even by alluding.

I believe my views as to the state of the country are shared by every European in Persia, and, making every allowance for the fact that Oriental countries continue to exist long after all semblance of good government has disappeared, I cannot think that the end of Persia, in its present form, is far off.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 133.

Memorandum.

IN an interview I had with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh on the evening of the 23rd ultimo, only a few hours after the destruction by a mob of the new office the Russian Bank was building near the bazaar in the city, his Excellency, referring to the incident, observed that the political situation in Persia is becoming more serious every day owing to the influence of the clergy and the weakness of the Government. I asked him whether in case of a more serious trouble the troops, who have not been paid for nearly a year, would obey orders. His Excellency replied that it was not likely, and added that unless the Government took strong measures against the clergy the situation would become more serious than ever, and that owing to the deplorable condition of the finances of the country nothing could be done for the present. He

observed that the troops and officials have not been paid for a long time, the banks are pressing the Government for the money due to them, and worst of all was the Shah's extravagance, which no mortal could check. His Majesty hardly makes any difference between 50 and 5,000,000 tomanus."

With regard to the present Grand Vizier, the Mushir-ed-Dowleh is of opinion that his Highness' position is very precarious at present owing to the want of money and the opposition of the clergy to him. I asked his Excellency who would succeed his Highness if he fell. He mentioned the ex-Atabeg, the Nizam-es-Sultaneh, who is now the Valiabad's Vazir at Tabreez, and the Mushir-es-Sultaneh, Minister of the Interior, an old and incapable man. I then asked whether he would accept the office, if offered to him. His Excellency replied that no sensible person would, under the present circumstances, accept it, and added that he was trying to find an excuse to resign his own office as Minister for Foreign Affairs, because he could get nothing done, and even when matters are referred to the Shah the Governors of the different provinces often neglect His Majesty's orders.

On my taking leave, the Mushir-ed-Dowleh asked me not to repeat what he had already told me, as it was private and confidential.

(Signed) ABBAS KULI.

Tehran, December 2, 1905.

No. 134.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 254.)

Tehran, December 3, 1905.

My Lord,

IN my despatch No. 237 of the 1st ultimo I had the honour to bring to your Lordship's notice the anarchical state of the Province of Fars.

In the inclosed correspondence your Lordship will see that, although the riots at Shiraz was nominally directed against the Jews, the movement was in reality a protest against the tyranny to which all classes of the population have been subjected by the Shua-es-Sultaneh and his officials.

I had repeatedly warned the Persian Government, both officially and unofficially, during the last few months, that the misgovernment which they allowed to continue in Fars could only end in one manner. On the 15th November Mr. Grahame telegraphed to me that an anti-Jewish agitation was raging, and that pillaging was taking place in the Jewish quarter of Shiraz. Although the movement was evidently directed against the local authorities, it was impossible to say what might happen if the rill-rall of a fanatical Mahomedan town were let loose on the Jews. Mr. Grahame, in my opinion, very properly did what he could with the small force of Indian cavalry at his disposal to protect such of the Jewish women and children as had taken refuge at the house of M. Veneziani, an Italian subject who resides at Shiraz. I made it quite clear to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that I should do what I could to prevent Jew-baiting, and addressed on the 22nd ultimo to his Excellency a note which I think had the effect of bringing the Persian Government to reason. Should the tenor of this note appear to your Lordship rather strong, I submit that it is necessary at times to speak very plainly to this hopelessly incompetent and corrupt Government. If Mr. Grahame and myself had not acted with vigour, the Persian Government would have done nothing to suppress an agitation which might easily have spread over the whole Province of Fars.

As regards the Jews, your Lordship will, I am confident, agree with me that they have recently received such inhuman treatment in Russia that it was excusable to stretch a point to prevent a repetition of outrages at Shiraz, where the populace are quite capable of any atrocity.

I telegraphed to your Lordship two days ago to say that Shiraz was then quiet: but it would appear from Mr. Grahame's telegram of to-day's date, copy of which I have the honour to inclose, that the principal Mujtahed in that town, the clergy, and merchants have, in a joint Petition, brought their just grievances to the notice of the Grand Vizier, and that unrest is reported from many districts of Fars.

I have not as yet officially asked for the removal of the Shua-es-Sultaneh and the Deputy Governor, and before doing so I shall, of course, ask for your Lordship's sanction. But I have spoken in the strongest manner both to the Grand Vizier and the Mushir-ed-Dowleh as to the necessity of a change of government in Fars. The latter openly

shares my views, and even the Ain-ed-Dowleh confidentially confessed to Abbas Kuli Khan that the state of the province "gave him great pain."

Unfortunately, the Shua-es-Sultaneh is the favourite son of the Shah, and, although details of the Prince's cruelty and oppression have been placed before His Majesty, he believes his son to be perfect, and the Vazir to be a valuable servant and competent Governor.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 134.

Telegraphic Correspondence between Mr. E. Grant Duff and Consul Grahame (Shiraz).

(1.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 82.)
(Telegraphic.) P.

November 15, 1905.

It is reported that an anti-Jewish agitation is now raging, that Moslems have destroyed a Jewish house, and are pillaging and beating Jews.

I am proceeding at once to the scene of the disturbance.

(2.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 83.)
(Telegraphic.) P.

November 15, 1905.

A large new house belonging to a Jew was this morning pillaged and destroyed by Seyyids and others, two Jews were wounded, and several shops pillaged. The disturbance was instigated by the clergy, and it is possible that the town authorities were in connivance, for, though they were apparently forewarned, they took no precautions. There is no doubt that the movement was aimed at the Vazir. It is anticipated that there will be further trouble, though all is quiet for the time being.

(3.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 84.)
(Telegraphic.) P.

November 16, 1905.

The movement is increasing, and is now openly directed against the Vazir. Last night there were no prayers in the mosques, and the shops have been closed both yesterday and to-day. A telegram detailing the universal grievances was sent yesterday to the Grand Vizier by the united clergy. The streets are patrolled by soldiers.

It is anticipated that the trouble may spread through the whole province. I think it would be well to warn the Persian Government how widespread and how deep the spirit of discontent is.

(4.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 85.)
(Telegraphic.) P.

November 17, 1905.

Yesterday afternoon soldiers repulsed a fresh attack made on the Jewish quarter. The town authorities see to the maintenance of order. The Vazir is shut up in his palace.

The instigator of the movement, Seyid Muhammed, sent me a verbal message this morning offering to put a stop to the anti-Jewish movement, but inviting me to intervene

for the redress of the grievances of the people. He intimated at the same time that he would not entertain any promise from the Vazir unless it were given through the British Consul.

I beg that you will instruct me by telegraph what answer I should return to this message.

Firing began in the Jewish quarter about the same time as the message was received. A mob from the mosque attacked Jewish houses near by, and the Cossacks and soldiers fired from the housetops. Up to mid-day there were three Moslems killed and ten wounded.

(5.)

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul Grahame.

(No. 56.)

November 17, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Shiraz riots. Your telegrams of to-day.

You should inform Seyid Muhammed that I am doing all I can to get order restored and to have the present Vazir removed, but that you cannot intervene officially on his behalf.

(6.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 86.)

November 18, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Shiraz riots. Your telegram No. 56.

No performance [sic] to-day. I have carried out your instructions.

(7.)

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul Grahame.

(No. 57.)

November 18, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

I have received a complaint from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that you have stationed sowars in the quarter of the town inhabited by the Jews.

This seems to me rather a dangerous proceeding, as, in order to call greater attention to their grievances, the rioters might kill them.

They should be withdrawn, unless, in your opinion, their presence is absolutely essential. Report the circumstances of the case.

(8.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 87.)

November 18, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

In reply to your telegram of to-day.

There are no sowars posted in the Jewish quarter, nor have there been any posted there.

(9.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 88.)

November 20, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

It is reported that the situation is somewhat critical. To-day a Jewess was shot, and it is anticipated that the Jewish quarter will be attacked to-night. It is possible that this alarm may be groundless. I cannot protect the Jewish quarter, but I have advised Veneziani to collect all the women and children into his house, which is large, and which the sowars must guard.

(10.)

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul Grahame.

(No. 58. Secret.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 21, 1905.

I have informed the Mushir-ed-Dowleh and the Italian Minister of your action (as reported in your telegram No. 88), which I approve.

I have reported the matter to the Foreign Office.

Both the Mushir-ed-Dowleh and the Grand Vizier are aware how lamentable the state of the province is, but they do not dare to oppose the Shah and certain of the courtiers who are in favour of the present Governor of Fars.

(11.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 90.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 21, 1905.

Shiraz riots. Your telegram of to-day.

The shops are still closed to-day, and there is much shouting, but no action. Last night passed quite quietly.

This morning the Salar-ul-Sultan gave me hope that the agitation would be speedily terminated (this depending on answers now expected from Tehran). He also gave me a solemn assurance for the safety of the Jewish inhabitants.

(12.)

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul Grahame.

(No. 60.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 21, 1905.

At the earliest moment consistent with the safety of the women and children, the sowars should be withdrawn from Veneziani's house. Local authorities have reported that you are intriguing with the malcontents, so that you should take the greatest care not to mix yourself up with the agitation.

(13.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 94.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 25, 1905.

Your telegram No. 60.

On the 21st November I withdrew the sowars from Veneziani's house, and I have now advised him to dismiss as soon as possible all those who had taken refuge with him.

The only dealings which I have had with the malcontents have been as follows:—

1. I answered Seyid Muhammad's message as instructed in your telegram No. 56.
2. A crowd gathered round the Consulate on the 22nd November, and I informed them that the only person who could cause justice to be done was the Shah, and that he would doubtless do so.

The agitation is not over, but is apparently much diminished. It may only be a phase.

According to a report, which is probably unbiassed, Seyid Muhammad and others have expressed their intention of taking refuge at this Consulate. It would be unusual to refuse to admit them, while to do so might create an awkward position, and it seems inadvisable to absent myself at the present moment.

Please telegraph instructions.

(14.)

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul Grahame.

(No. 61.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 26, 1905.

Your telegram No. 94.

I will warn the Mushir-ed-Dowleh of the rumour. You should try to dissuade Seyid Muhammad and his friends from seeking asylum at the Consulate, but you cannot refuse it.

(15.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 95.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

November 27, 1905.

It looks as if the agitation in Shiraz were ended for the present.

(16.)

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 96. Secret.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

December 2, 1905.

Situation in Fars.

Mirza Ibrahim, the clergy, and the merchants yesterday morning telegraphed a long Petition to the Grand Vizier stating that, instead of the 6,000 tomans formerly paid by Fars, 20,000 had been extorted, exposing other grievances, and demanding justice.

I am sending particulars by post.

The Grand Vizier is apparently temporizing, and it would look as if he had bribed the Kavan-ul-Mulk.

From many districts there are reports of unrest.

This may prove much more serious.

Inclosure 2 in No. 134.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

(Private and Confidential.)

Tehran, November 16, 1905.

Dear Mushir-ed-Dowleh,

I HAD the honour to inform your Excellency yesterday verbally that the anti-Jewish agitation had recommenced in Shiraz.

This morning I have had a further telegram from Mr. Grahame, reporting that one large new Jewish house has been destroyed and pillaged by Seyyids, and several shops have been looted; two Jews have been wounded. The authorities were warned that an attack on the Jews was to take place, but I need hardly say that no precautions to prevent it were taken. His Majesty's Consul adds that the town is now quiet, but that further trouble is anticipated.

I hope, for the sake of its good name, the Persian Government will not allow the Jews to be ill-treated. As your Excellency is aware, the abominable and inhuman treatment which the Jews have lately received in Russia has excited the indignation and scorn of the civilized world.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 3 in No. 134.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

November 17, 1905.

Dear Mushir-ed-Dowleh,

WITH reference to my private letter to your Excellency of yesterday, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that the agitation at Shiraz is increasing, and that trouble is anticipated throughout Fars.

I have already repeatedly, both officially and unofficially, warned both your Excellency and the Grand Vizier of the lamentable state to which Fars has been reduced owing to the incapacity, cruelty, and tyranny of the Shun-es-Sultaneh and his Vazir.

I again repeat my warning, and shall hold the Persian Government responsible for any damage which may accrue to British interests in that province through the misgovernment of the local authorities.

Inclosure 4 in No. 134.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

November 17, 1905.

WITH reference to your note of to-day's date, stating that some trouble is anticipated at Shiraz, I have the honour to inform you that strong orders have been telegraphed to the local authorities to prevent the trouble and maintain order, and no doubt the necessary steps will be taken by them.

Inclosure 5 in No. 134.

Consul Grahame to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 134)

Sir,

Shiraz, November 18, 1905.

WITH reference to telegraphic correspondence on the subject of Shiraz riots ending with your telegram No. 56 of yesterday's date, I have the honour to invite your attention to that portion of the Shiraz News (26th October to the 18th November) herewith inclosed, giving details of the events of the last few days.

It is difficult to deduce from conflicting reports how far the movement has spread or is likely to spread.

The instigator of it, Seyyid Muhammad, is not, so far as I can gather, a person of high rank or good reputation among the local clergy, the superior members of which, like Mirza Ibrahim, while joining in the movement, do so in a somewhat half-hearted way, perhaps judging that its success may create a rival reputation at the expense of their own, its failure compromise their dignity.

The popular voice, possibly erroneously, credits Salar-ul-Sultan with initiating and fostering the movement. Outwardly he has exerted the utmost energy in keeping it within bounds and maintaining order, while the Sardar* remains, as far as I can learn, inert.

The persons and property of Europeans have not, in my opinion, been in any danger up to this date, nor do I anticipate that they will be. *Pro forma*, however, I addressed a note on the 15th instant to the Karguzar requesting necessary precautions for their protection. Foreseeing that highly exaggerated rumours of the present occurrences in Shiraz are likely to gain credence in the outlying districts, where, of late, there has been a little unrest, I on the same date addressed to the telegraph offices of Kazeroon, Bamsun, and Dehbidan identical message requesting the telegraph officials in charge to let it be known on my authority that the agitation at Shiraz was not serious, and that the authorities were keeping order.

Some notes have not been lacking, the most ludicrous being a telegram which the Karguzar drafted and sent to me yesterday, requesting me to dispatch it in my own name to you. It represented Shiraz swimming in blood; the European residents rescued

* The Vazir of Fars, or Deputy Governor.

by the devotion of the Karguzar, through whom, and whom alone, the present crisis might, insbAllah! be conjured!

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. GRAHAME.

Inclosure 6 in No. 134.

Shiraz News, November 18, 1905.

ON the 15th November the pseudo-anti-Jewish movement, some recrudescence of which had of late been noted, broke out in a somewhat serious form.

At 10 A.M. on that day M. Veneziani (one of the professors in the Jewish school), came in haste to the Consulate stating that a rabble was destroying a house in the Jewish quarter, beating and pillaging. Mr. Grahame proceeded about 11 A.M. to the quarter with M. Veneziani and two sowars. The trouble was by that time over for the moment. A large house recently built by a Jew named Mordecai had been partially torn down, several shops pillaged, two Jews wounded, neither, as subsequently transpired, at all seriously.

From subsequent inquiries it appears that the house in question had been for some time a stumbling-block to some of the Mollahs and their more fanatical followers. Its height was about the same as that of the one opposite. The building of it had, however, partially obstructed a thoroughfare. Scarcely was it completed when (about the 10th November) a certain Mollah, Seyyid Muhammad (son of the late Mujtehed Seyyid Al Akbar, notorious for his leading part in the tobacco riots), commanded the owner to pull it down, and actually sent some of his men to do so. The owner appealed to the Sardar, who took up a strong attitude against the Mollah, and informed the Jew, who now offered to pull the house down, that if he did so his hands would be chopped off.

An acrimonious contest appears to have ensued between the Vazir and the Mollah, the latter sending a message to the effect that he was not his father's son if he did not cause the Vazir to be expelled from Shiraz, to which the Vazir replied in a similar choice strain. On the night of the 14th a kind of mass meeting was held at Mirza Muhammad's house, which the Salar-ul-Sultan was seen to leave at 2 A.M.

M. Veneziani was about that time assured by Mirza Reza Khan that there was no danger for the Jews. He, however, caused a certain portion of a large quantity of gun-tragacanth deposited in the house (part of which gun belonged to a German merchant) to be removed. The farrashes of the Salar-ul-Sultan did not arrive on the scene until after the mischief was done.

The Sardar is said to have made an appeal to Mirza Ibrahim, professing himself the humble servant of the Shah and begging him to quell the popular movement—which is well understood to be directed against the Sardar, the Jews being merely a pretext; Mirza Ibrahim to have replied that he was quite ready to do so, but the discontent was too widespread and deep for him to allay.

The Imam-i-Jumma on the 14th November retired from the town. The rest of the clergy are united against the Sardar, and on the afternoon of the 15th November sent a lengthy telegram to Ain-ed-Dowleh, detailing various categories of popular grievances. The local authorities placed extra guards over the Imperial Bank, and caused the whole town to be patrolled with soldiers. On the morning of the 16th the movement had considerably increased, and was openly directed against the Sardar, the people gathering in and round the houses of the chief Mujteheds shouting "Ya Ali!" and clamouring for redress of injustices.

Late in the afternoon of that day another attack was reported to have been made on the Jewish quarter, but to have been repulsed, the mob apparently flying as soon as the soldiers raised their rifles.

On the morning of the 17th November a verbal message was brought to Mr. Grahame from Seyyid Muhammad, instigator of the movement, undertaking to put a stop to the attacks on the Jews, but claiming the assistance and sympathy of the British Consulate on behalf of the oppressed people of Fars, denouncing the Sardar as the source of the present evils, and declaring that no promise from him could be listened to except through the British Consulate.

Answer was deferred pending reference to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires.

This message had scarcely been delivered when news of firing in the Jewish quarter and of fresh pillaging reached Mr. Grahame, who proceeded to the spot with

M. Veneziani. Attacks had been made by a mob from the "Masjad-i-Nou" on some adjoining Jewish houses, the tops of which had been held by the Mir Panj of Cossacks and thirty or forty soldiers.

On the Mir Panj's invitation, Mr. Grahame entered one house to join him, but found the stairway barred by men bundling down a Moslem lad with a severe rifle wound. After causing the wounded man to be carried to the house of a neighbouring Armenian doctor and sending for Dr. Palmer, Mr. Grahame joined the Mir Panj on the roof. Soldiers and Cossacks were posted on the neighbouring house-tops under shelter of bits of wall. The house-tops were strewn with brickbats and stones. The roof of the mosque, about 250 yards off, was lined with a big crowd.

The Mir Panj explained that a mob of Lootis, some armed, had attempted to make their way from the roof of the mosque over the housetops into the Jewish houses. He had ordered his men to fire in the air. They had done so at first, then a few shots had been aimed at the advancing mob.

Salar-ul-Sultan, who now joined the party, brought the news that the wounded lad was dead, adding that he was the third victim of that morning. Ten others, all Moslems, had been wounded. Mr. Grahame, at Salar-ul-Sultan's special request, then withdrew.

The afternoon passed quietly. Several soldiers reported missing. At night the soldiers were withdrawn from the Jewish quarter, and the Salar's farrashes and "tufanghis" substituted.

November 18. People gathered in the Madrisseh-i-Khan and some of the mosques in crowds. Shops still closed. A good deal of shouting going on, but no active disturbances yet reported (2 to 3 p.m.). The Shah is said to have sent an angry answer to the Mujtehed telegram, bidding them go to the mosques and pray, or, if they have any grievances, to send a representative to Tehran.

The Mujtehed is reported to have smiled.

Prince Jemal-ul-Din, whose grievances have figured in the programme of the malecontents, is about to start for Tehran, in answer to a summons from Amir-ul-Dowleh.

Mr. Grahame, under instructions from Tehran, has answered Seyyid Muhammad that he cannot intervene officially, but that His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires is doing his best to cause removal of Vazir and pacification of Fars.

Inclosure 7 in No. 134.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

(Private.)

Dear Mushir-ed-Dowleh,

Tehran, November 19, 1905.

At your Excellency's verbal request, I telegraphed yesterday to His Majesty's Consul at Shiraz to inquire why Indian sowars had been posted in the Jewish quarter of that town.

Mr. Grahame has replied to the effect that no Indian sowars are or have been posted in the Jewish quarter. This is a further instance of the inaccuracy of the information sent by the Sardar-i-Akram to the Central Government.

I await an answer to the message which I sent to your Excellency two days ago through Abbas Kuli Khan.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 8 in No. 134.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Tehran, November 21, 1905.

Your Excellency,

HIS Majesty's Consul at Shiraz reports that the situation in that town continues critical, and that he has advised M. Veneziani, who is an Italian subject, to collect all the Jewish women and children into his house, which will be guarded by the British Consulate sowars.

As a Jewess was shot yesterday, and in my opinion the local authorities are incapable of adequately protecting either foreign interests or the Jewish inhabitants, I consider Mr. Grahame's action necessary.

I need hardly say that should any of the Indian escort be killed or wounded by the rioters the Persian Government will be held responsible.

(Signed)

E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 9 in No. 134.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

November 21, 1905.

(Translation.)

I HAVE received your note of the 21st instant respecting the Jews at Shiraz and the measures taken by the British Consul.

In reply I have the honour to state that, as you were informed, orders have been issued and steps taken for the restoration and maintenance of peace at Shiraz, and the matter will be pressed again. Under these circumstances, the measures taken by the British Consul in regard to the Jews are beyond the sphere of the Consul's duty, and no doubt you will be good enough to instruct him to desist from taking such measures and to leave the Persian Jews alone, because the Persian Government is more justified in protecting the lives and property of its own subjects, and it will take the necessary steps for that purpose; otherwise, the responsibility for any untoward incident which may take place will rest with the person who has exceeded his duty. With regard to the woman, she had been shot by accident.

Inclosure 10 in No. 134.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

November 22, 1905.

(Translation.)

I HAVE received your note of yesterday regarding the situation at Shiraz.

I have frequently told your Excellency that I think the present Governor of Fars wholly incapable of maintaining order in that town. Not only shall I not withdraw the Indian sowars from M. Veneziani's house, where the Jewish women and children are in refuge, but, should the riots at Shiraz continue, I shall be compelled to advise His Majesty's Government to strengthen the Consular guard at Shiraz by the immediate dispatch of British Indian infantry from Bushire.

I have already informed your Excellency that I hold the Persian Government responsible for the anarchy existing in the Province of Fars, and for the safety of the lives and property of British subjects in Shiraz and its neighbourhood.

Inclosure 11 in No. 134.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

November 26, 1905.

(Translation.)

I HAVE the honour to inform you that the Indian sowars have been withdrawn from M. Veneziani's house.

With regard to certain rumours which Abbas Kuli Khan tells me have reached the Persian Government to the effect that Mr. Grahame is intriguing with the malcontents of Shiraz, I would observe that Mr. Grahame has only twice communicated with them:—

1. He stated to a crowd which came to the Consulate that His Majesty the Shah alone could and no doubt would see justice done.
2. By my instructions he informed them that he could not officially intervene on their behalf.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 255.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 4, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 238, Confidential, of the 5th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith further correspondence relating to the Urmi murder case and the attack on Captain Gough.

Your Lordship will see from Mr. Wratislaw's despatch of the 28th October last that Bagher Khan, the Persian Commissioner, probably purposely, allowed the Kurdish prisoners he had brought from Tabreez and Tehran to escape during the journey to Urmi, and that their return home was made the occasion of demonstrations of triumph and public rejoicing. Both the Mushir-ed-Dowleh and Bagher Khan (see inclosures in my despatch No. 238) were duly warned of what was likely to happen, but no adequate steps appear to have been taken, and the Kurds left Tehran and Tabreez armed to the teeth, although nominally prisoners charged with a capital offence. The accused Kurds have as yet, very naturally, refused to come to Urmi to be tried, and although it appears from Mr. Wratislaw's telegram to me of the 2nd instant that the Valiahd has sent a further emissary to them to persuade them to attend the inquiry, I shall be surprised if his mission leads to any result.

During Ramadan no progress has in fact been made towards the settlement of this miserable case, and unless my United States' colleague takes more effective measures than he has done in the past to force the Persian Government to carry out their engagements, I do not see any prospect of a satisfactory settlement being effected in the near future, or, indeed, ever. As a specimen of Mr. Pearson's diplomacy, I would draw your Lordship's attention to his note to the Persian Government, copy of which is inclosed in his letter to me of the 18th ultimo. In the penultimate paragraph of this remarkable document Mr. Pearson practically recommends that the principal murderer, Seyyid Ghaffar, should be tortured, that being the usual and time-honoured method in Persia of dealing with prisoners who decline to be communicative. The Lahore murderer being directly the concern of the United States' Government, I took no further notice of his note beyond informing him privately that I would in no way countenance the torture of the Seyyid, and that if he chose to recommend such a course to the Persian Government he did so entirely on his own responsibility.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 135.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Urmi, October 28, 1905.

Sir, I HAVE the honour to report that I left Tabreez on the 14th and reached Urmi on the 18th instant. Mirza Bagher Khan started two days later.

On the 18th I received information that a large body of Kurds from the villages of Gurghin (Kurdish) Beg and Tellu Beg had gone out to meet their chiefs. They appear to have been under the impression that I was so foolish as to bring the men behind me, and they actually stopped my baggage caravan (which was some hours late) and interrogated my servants on the subject. A party of them stayed the night of the 18th in Saath, 12 miles from Urmi, and there, without the slightest provocation, shot a Kurd belonging to a rival tribe, who, with four companions, was bringing in taxes due by his tribe to the Persian Government. I have subsequently heard that this man was only dangerously wounded, and not killed, as previously reported. His horse, however, was shot dead. Gurghin and Tellu were met near Gavilan and taken direct to Dasht, without passing through Urmi. The entry into their villages was made the occasion of a great demonstration of triumph and public rejoicing.

Mirza Bagher Khan seems to have parted with his Kurds near Dilman, two days' journey from here. He stayed there a couple of days (as he says, in order to renew

acquaintance with an old friend, but, as I conjecture, for the purpose of urging the local authorities to procure evidence tending to incriminate Shekoik Kurds in the murder of Mr. Labaree), and reached Urmi on the 22nd. In reply to my reproaches for having allowed the Kurds to escape in spite of my previous warning, he repeated that he had no instructions to keep them as prisoners, and that, even had he received such instructions, a poor old civilian like himself would have been powerless to execute them, and that orders should have been sent to the Governor-General of Tabreez to provide a sufficient military escort. There is something in this explanation, but I consider that Bagher Khan failed in his duty in not referring the matter to Tehran on the receipt of my letter.

Bagher Khan expresses himself as quite confident that Gurghin and Tellu will come in eventually, but not till Ramadan is over, and that they will bring with them all the persons whose presence is necessary at the inquiry. They are, he says, too pious and strict Mussulmans not to desire to keep the month of fasting in their own homes. I do not feel competent to express an opinion of my own upon this point, but persons who know the Kurds well think that, while Gurghin (against whom personally we bring no charge) may come, the others will decline to do so.

In any case, the inquiry may be regarded as postponed for a month, and all I can do during Ramadan is to settle the procedure with Bagher Khan. I do not anticipate any great difficulty in coming to an agreement with him on this subject, but I much fear that we shall end by differing completely on the main issue. Last night, while to some extent under the influence of distilled waters, in which condition he is disposed to be garrulous, he confided to me that he was convinced of the innocence of the Dasht Kurds, and almost sure that the accomplices of Seyyid Ghaffar in the murder of Mr. Labaree were certain Mohammedi (Shekoik) Kurds. He did not, however, name them or state the grounds on which his opinion is based. I may add that my personal relations with Bagher Khan are quite satisfactory.

I have found Imam Kuli Mirza, the Prince-Governor of Urmi, very friendly, but most anxious to have as little as possible to do with this investigation, which, indeed, seems to be regarded by all Persian officials in these parts as a perfect nightmare. Bagher Khan alone is of the sort who rush in where angels fear to tread. On hearing of the reception being prepared for Gurghin and Tellu, I at once informed the Governor, who undertook to send a sufficient force to prevent any demonstration and to bring the travellers into Urmi. I am unable to say whether this promise would have been kept had it been found possible to collect enough horsemen for the purpose within the short time available.

Imam Kuli Mirza denies most positively that he has ever received instructions from Mushir-ed-Dowleh or from any one else to issue the notice regarding protection of witnesses referred to in your telegram No. 40 of the 6th instant. Under the circumstances of the case I do not imagine that possible witnesses could attach the slightest importance to such an announcement on the part of the Persian authorities, and I only mention the point as an additional proof, were any required, of the flagrant bad faith of the Persian Government in this matter.

I have, &c.

(Signed) A. C. WRATISLAW.

Inclosure 2 in No. 135.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

American Legation, Tehran, November 6, 1905.

Dear Sir,

I HEREBY acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 4th instant, inclosing a telegram from Consul-General Wratislaw, dated Urmi, the 3rd November.

In reply to Mr. Wratislaw's inquiry as to the minimum of punishment on which the American Government will insist, I would say that by the terms of the Agreement dated the 3rd January, 1905, the Persian Government has pledged itself to punish the accomplices in the murder "according to the measure of their guilt." The precise form of punishment has not been stated, but I am prepared to state that my Government will not consider "flogging" as either a suitable or an adequate punishment for participation in the crime of murder.

I have demanded of the Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs that Mir Ghaffar, the chief murderer, be forced to give the names of the men who aided and abetted him in

[1598]

the crime; if the necessary evidence cannot be had at Urmi, it can certainly and quickly be obtained in Tehran by methods well known and often employed by the Persian Government when it has earnestly desired and endeavoured to ascertain the truth; and while the "sacred character" of the chief murderer may save him from the death penalty, it can hardly exempt him from the obligation to tell the truth.

I have, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 3 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Wratislaw.

(No. 47.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 8, 1905.

YOUR telegram No. 74.

I am informed by the American Minister that the Persian Government, by the terms of its Agreement, pledged itself to mete out to the accomplices in the murder punishment in accordance with the measure of their guilt. His Government would consider flogging both an inadequate and unsuitable punishment.

He has now demanded from the Persian Government that Seyyid Ghaffar be forced to divulge the names of those who assisted in the murder. He seems to suggest that torture be employed; but I have not yet seen his note to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Of course I cannot be a party to a prisoner being subjected to torture.

Inclosure 4 in No. 135.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 76.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tabreez, November 13, 1905.

THE Seyyid will probably say whatever he is told to say, so that the American Minister's appeal to his evidence seems to me a dangerous experiment, as Mr. Pearson will be bound to some extent to accept it. I will not, however, trouble the Minister with any more suggestions, but will limit myself to watching the Persian Commissioner's proceedings, if, indeed, he ever does anything, and reporting upon them.

What punishment does His Majesty's Government demand for the men who attacked Gough?

Inclosure 5 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Wratislaw.

(No. 48.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, November 16, 1905.

YOUR telegram No. 76 of the 13th November.

The punishment demanded by His Majesty's Government is imprisonment for life, with the possibility of an eventual reduction to twenty years.

Gough's case, you must remember, is not the only one of the kind.

Inclosure 6 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Sir,

Tehran, November 14, 1905.

I HAVE just received a telegram from His Majesty's Consul-General at Urmi, in which he suggests that it is a dangerous experiment to try and obtain evidence from

Seyyid Ghaffar. Mr. Wratislaw is of the opinion that the Seyyid may be told by the Persian Government what he is to say, and that you may be to some extent bound by it.

Mr. Wratislaw states that the Persian Commissioner has, as yet, taken no steps to initiate the inquiry.

You were so good as to say that you would furnish me with a copy of the note which you recently addressed to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh on the subject of the possibility of obtaining evidence from the principal murderer now in prison. If there is no objection, I have the honour to request you to furnish me with a copy of the document in question.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 7 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Tehran, November 15, 1905.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith, in original, a despatch received to-day from Mr. Wratislaw regarding the situation at Urmi. I would venture to call your special attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Wratislaw's communication, which furnishes a further proof, if such is necessary, that the Persian Government are merely trifling with us.

I request that you will be so good as to return the inclosed document after perusal.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 8 in No. 135.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

My dear Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, November 15, 1905.

IN compliance with your request, I inclose herein a copy of my note to Mushir-ed-Dowleh in relation to the testimony of Mir Ghaffar.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) RICHMOND PEARSON.

Inclosure 9 in No. 135.

Mr. Pearson to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

[Undated.]

Your Excellency,

I HAVE been informed by His Britannic Majesty's Consul-General Wratislaw, representing the American Government at the trial of the Kurds at Urmi, that no progress has been made, or is likely to be made, at that place in securing evidence against the accomplices in the murder of Mr. Labaree.

I have heretofore pointed out to your Excellency that such evidence is within easy reach of your Government if it earnestly desires and endeavours to ascertain the truth. That evidence can certainly be had, and quickly, at Tehran—it is in the possession of the self-confessed chief murderer, Mir Ghaffar, who is incarcerated here. This man knows the names of the men who aided and abetted him in committing the murder. While his sacred character may save him from the death penalty, it cannot exempt him from telling the truth.

Now, therefore, on behalf of the American Government, and in the name of truth and justice, I demand formally and peremptorily that the Persian Government oblige Mir Ghaffar to disclose the names of his accomplices in this murder, and that you telegraph such names to your Commissioner at Urmi to the end that justice be meted out in accordance with the solemn pledge of your Government.

Your Excellency must be aware that many instances can be cited in Persian history in which Seyyids have been executed for crime, and countless instances can be cited in which witnesses have been forced to tell the truth, by methods well known and often employed by your judicial authorities when they earnestly desire to discover and punish crime. So it will be utterly unreasonable and unavailing for your Government to declare that after using all the means in its power it has been unable to discover the perpetrators of this crime.

These are plain words, but the time has arrived for bringing this business to a clear-cut conclusion.

I avail, &c.
(Signed) RICHMOND PEARSON.

Inclosure 10 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Sir, *Tehran, November 17, 1905.*
HIS Majesty's Acting Consul-General at Tabreez has telegraphed to me to say that two Kurdish servants in the employ of Majid-es-Saltaneh have been sent to the house of the Ferrash-bashi of the Valiahd, with the intention of coercing them into stating that they helped to murder Mr. Labaree. Positive proof is in possession of His Majesty's Consulate-General that these unfortunate men are quite innocent, and I earnestly hope that you will see your way to preventing injustice being done to them.

I have told the Mushir-ed-Dowleh that I have informed you in the above sense for such action as you see fit to take.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 11 in No. 135.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

My dear Sir, *American Legation, Tehran, November 18, 1905.*
I BEG to acknowledge your favour of the 15th instant, inclosing a despatch, dated the 28th October, from Consul-General Wratistaw, which I herein return as requested; also your note of the 17th in relation to the attempt to incriminate the servants of Majid-es-Saltaneh, who have established an *alibi* to the satisfaction of Consul-General Wratistaw. I have presented the substance of both these despatches to Mushir-ed-Dowleh, and have asked for an explanation of the shocking variance between the things promised at Tehran and the things done at Urmi.

Yours, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

Inclosure 12 in No. 135.

Consul-General Wratistaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Urmi, November 19, 1905.*
BACHER KHAN has informed the Valiahd, by telegraph, that the accused Kurds have refused to attend the inquiry unless it be held at some place outside the town, and they be allowed to come armed. Valiahd has replied to the Kurds that it is imperative that they should surrender, and he added, I believe, that the trial would be purely formal. No answer has yet been given by the Kurds.

I am of opinion that the inquiry will be quite satisfactory if the Mollah is not allowed to return to Urmi. I will endeavour to impress upon his adherents here how lenient we have been, and it is possible that they may give me something in return. For the moment they are much depressed, and have requested the missionaries to intercede on their behalf.

Inclosure 13 in No. 135.

Consul-General Wratistaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P. *Urmi, November 23, 1905.*
I RECEIVED a letter from Gurgin asking me to meet him 6 miles out of Urmi. In a simultaneous letter to the missionaries he persisted in denying the complicity of the Kurds, so I informed him that it would be useless for me to meet him. I added that His Majesty's Government would not demand the execution of Gough's assailants if they surrendered and confessed.

Seeing that the American Minister is reluctant to sanction any arrangement, it did not seem worth while to incur even the slight risk which an interview with Gurgin would entail.

I understand that an Aide-de-camp sent by the Valiahd to induce the accused Kurds to surrender has returned without accomplishing the object of his mission.

A friend of the Urmi Mollah begged me that he might be allowed to return. I replied that I would recommend His Majesty's Government not to press for his removal to Tehran, but that the murderers must be convicted before he could be allowed to return to Urmi.

Inclosure 14 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Sir, *Tehran, November 28, 1905.*
I HAVE the honour to inform your Excellency that I have received a telegram from Mr. Stevens, British Acting Consul-General at Tabreez, stating that, from a long conversation which he has had with the Karguzar, he gathers that the Valiahd is anxious to come to some arrangement about the Labaree murder trial and the affairs of the Majid-es-Saltaneh.

The Karguzar told Mr. Stevens privately that the Prince would probably allow the Majid to go to Europe and legalize arrangements for the safe custody of his property, if some concessions were made with regard to the accused Kurds. Mr. Stevens replied vaguely that in his opinion both your Excellency and I would insist upon the Kurds being punished; but suggested that, as a special favour, and under certain conditions, you might possibly consent to demand something less than the death penalty.

As Mr. Stevens is shortly to have an audience of the Valiahd and anticipates that His Imperial Highness will broach the subject, he asked me for instructions, and I have accordingly telegraphed to him to-day that he should inform the Valiahd that the question of the punishment of the Labaree murderers is one for the decision of the United States' Government. With regard to the punishment of Captain Gough's assailants, I informed him that His Majesty's Government demanded no less than penal servitude for life, and I left it to his discretion to decide whether it would be opportune to inform His Imperial Highness of this at present.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 15 in No. 135.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

My dear Sir, *American Legation, Tehran, November 28, 1905.*
I BEG to acknowledge your letter of this date in relation to the attitude of the Valiahd. I inclose translation of a note received a few days ago from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, which kindly return after reading.

I am convinced that it would be inexpedient to make any change in the demands for the punishment of the Kurds, at least until a clear-cut and trustworthy proposition comes from the Persian Government.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) RICHMOND PEARSON.

Inclosure 16 in No. 135.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Mr. Pearson.

Your Excellency,

November 21, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge, and have understood the meaning of, the communication of the respected Legation dated the 18th November, 1905, concerning the murder of Mr. Labaree, and, in reply, beg to state that, in accordance with the former request of the Legation, orders were sent by telegraph to the Government authorities at Urmī to give public notice that witnesses in the case would be protected from molestation; and now, again, orders have been telegraphed to the Government of Urmī and other places to proclaim whatever is necessary to give assurances to the witnesses who may be called to testify in this matter.

With respect to the accusation brought against the two servants of the Majid-es-Saltaneh, about which you have written, I have to state that inquiries have been made, and it has been found that there was no foundation for the report, and that no one had considered them responsible parties in this crime.

In conformity with the request of the Legation that inquiries should be made of Mir Ghaflar, I have to state that the Minister for Foreign Affairs is now engaged in trying to ascertain from him the names of the persons implicated in this murder.

I avail, &c.
(Sealed) Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

Inclosure 17 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Sir,

Tehran, November 30, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that in a telegram dated the 23rd November, which only reached me yesterday, Mr. Wratislaw states that he has refused to meet Gurghin at an interview to which that Chief invited him, as, in view of the fact that Gurghin wrote simultaneously to the missionaries denying the complicity of the Kurds in the murder of Mr. Labaree, it seemed useless to enter into communication with him.

Mr. Wratislaw further states that the Valiahd has sent an Aide-de-camp to Dasht to try to persuade the accused Kurds to surrender. It appears, however, that he was unsuccessful in his mission.

I have the honour to return to you herewith the note addressed to your Excellency by the Mushir-ed-Dowleh on the 21st instant, and beg to thank you for your courtesy in communicating it to me.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 18 in No. 135.

Consul-General Wratislaw to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Urmī, December 2, 1905.

MY telegram No. 78 of the 23rd November.

A second emissary has been dispatched by the Valiahd, and is expected daily.

Has any information been obtained by the American Minister from Mir Ghaflar?

Inclosure 19 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Consul-General Wratislaw.

(No. 51.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 4, 1905.

YOUR telegram No. 79.

American Minister has been informed by Mushir-ed-Dowleh that efforts are being made to ascertain the names of his accomplices from the chief murderer.

Inclosure 20 in No. 135.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mr. Pearson.

Sir,

Tehran, December 3, 1905.

MR. WRATISLAW telegraphs to say that the Valiahd has again sent an emissary to try and persuade the accused Kurds to come in. He inquires whether you have succeeded in obtaining any information from Seyyid Ghaflar.

Would you kindly let me know what answer I should return to His Majesty's Consul-General.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 21 in No. 135.

Mr. Pearson to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Sir,

American Legation, Tehran, December 3, 1905.

IN reply to your note of this date, I beg to say that I have no information as to the testimony of Mir Ghaflar except the statement in Mushir-ed-Dowleh's note of the 21st November, to the effect that efforts were being made to ascertain from the chief murderer the names of his accomplices.

I have, &c.
(Signed) R. PEARSON.

No. 136.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 256.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 5, 1905.

IN obedience to the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram No. 89 of the 29th ultimo, I addressed to the Atabeg-i-Azam the note, copy of which I have the honour to inclose, regarding the insecurity of the caravan routes in South Persia.

I shall as soon as possible furnish your Lordship with the particulars of the various robberies of British-owned goods which have occurred. In each case a claim for compensation has been preferred against the Persian Government.

The caravans which carry goods in Persia for foreign firms are, as far as I know, always owned by natives.

The Atabeg-i-Azam is at present absent from Tehran, but on his Highness' return I shall see him, and give him the hint mentioned in your Lordship's telegram.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 136.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Atabeg-i-Azam.

(Translation.)

December 4, 1905.

AS I had the honour to inform the Mushir-ed-Dowleh and yourself, I recently brought to the knowledge of His Majesty's Government the danger involved to British commercial interests by the insecurity prevailing in the Province of Fars.

I am instructed by His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to point out for your Highness' serious consideration that the roads leading from Bushire to Shiraz and thus to the interior of Persia will soon be as unsafe as the Arabistan route, while the insecurity of the Bander Abbas route is notorious, and has repeatedly been brought to the notice of the Persian Government by His Majesty's Legation. It appears to His Majesty's Government that the Government of His Majesty the Shah are

gradually losing their hold on Southern Persia, to the great injury of British commercial interests. I am to inform your Highness that, if the present unsatisfactory condition of things on the roads referred to is permitted to continue, His Majesty's Government will be obliged to take such measures as may be necessary for the protection of these interests.

In these circumstances, I earnestly hope your Excellency will lose no time in taking adequate steps to establish security on the trade routes of Southern Persia.

No. 137.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne. (Received December 23.)

(No. 257.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 5, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 91 of the 1st instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of the note I have addressed to the Persian Government regarding the Seistan Water Award.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 137.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

December 2, 1905.

INFORMATION recently reached His Majesty's Government that the Yamin-i-Nizam has forwarded a letter to the Afghan Government stating that Persia having declined to accept Colonel McMahon's arbitral sentence in the Seistan water dispute, that sentence is inoperative, and that the Government of His Majesty the Shah therefore revert to the *status quo ante* and to the Goldsmid Award.

I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to inquire whether, in making the above communication to the Afghan Government, the Yamin-i-Nizam acted under orders from the Persian Government. If this was not the case, I am to request that your Excellency will be so good as to direct him at once to withdraw his letter.

I am also to point out to your Excellency that, as the Government of His Majesty the Shah formally requested His Majesty's Government to arbitrate between Persia and Afghanistan in the Seistan water dispute, the Persian Government cannot revert to the *status quo* simply because they are dissatisfied with the arbitral Award given by Colonel McMahon. The proper course for the Persian Government to pursue is to represent their objections to the Arbitrator's decision to the Representative of the British Government at Tehran, and if, after discussion, they are still of opinion that the Award is injurious to Persian interests, to appeal to His Majesty's Government against it.

While informing your Excellency in the above sense, I am to make it clear that, although His Majesty's Government are willing to review the Award given by the Arbitrator, and to listen to any representations which the Persian Government may desire to make, they are unable to allow them, as one of the parties interested in the arbitration, to notify to the other party their intention to disregard the arbitral sentence. I have, in conclusion, the honour to state that, unless the Persian Government submit their appeal within a reasonable period, His Majesty's Government will consider the arbitral Award given by Colonel McMahon as final, and will take effective measures to render it operative.

No. 138.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne. (Received December 23.)

(No. 258.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 5, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram of the 5th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a note which I have addressed to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh regarding the Lurs concerned in the attack on Colonel Douglas and Captain Lorimer.

I also inclose the last report I have received from Captain Gough with regard to the matter.

I have repeatedly urged the Mushir-ed-Dowleh to send orders to the Firman Firman to take steps to arrest the remaining persons implicated in the outrage, and his Excellency telegraphed about the middle of last month to Kermanshah for a report as to how the case stood.

I shall speak to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh again to-morrow about the matter, but I do not believe that the Persian Government is taking, or intends to take, any further steps with a view to bringing the case to a satisfactory settlement.

His Excellency openly says that he can get nothing done under the present Grand Vizier, and that the provincial officials set his orders at naught.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 138.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

Tehran, November 17, 1905.

I HAVE already had the honour to inform you verbally that Colonel Douglas and Lieutenant Lorimer are only able positively to identify from the photograph one of the Lurs as having been concerned in the attack upon them in the autumn of last year. The Lur identified is Mirkani Khan.

In these circumstances I am instructed by His Majesty's Government to point out to your Excellency that, before Mirkani Khan is punished for his share in the outrage, it is important that steps should be taken to arrest more, or, if possible, all, of the numerous persons who were accomplices in the crime.

I am to request your Excellency to urge the Firman Firman to endeavour to secure the other persons concerned in the attack, either by negotiation, or, failing this, by the resumption of the operations which his Highness promised to undertake after the harvest.

I have the honour to ask your Excellency to inform me at an early date what steps the Persian Government are taking to bring the remaining offenders to justice.

(Signed) E. GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 2 in No. 138.

Consul Gough to Mr. E. Grant Duff

(No. 68.)

Sir,

Kermanshah, November 2, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that his Highness the Firman Firman returned here on the 27th ultimo after an absence of nearly nine and a-half months.

I had an interview with his Highness on the 1st instant, and asked him whether he had been able to carry out Sir A. Hardinge's wish that he should crown his success in arresting six of the authors of the attack on Colonel Douglas by effecting the capture of any of the other persons who had assisted in that attack.

His Highness informed me that he had not been able to effect any more captures. He said, however, that the whole affair was now satisfactorily settled, and told me incidentally that he had never had to work so hard in his life before as to induce this satisfactory state of affairs.

In another sentence he said that "Luristan est absolument pôle-môle," which rather contradicted his first statement.

His Highness informed me confidentially that he has sent in his resignation of the Governorship of the Laristan district. I have heard a report here that he wishes to place the Governorship in the hands of his son, Firuz Mirza, the Nasrah-ed-Dowleh, and it is commonly reported here that the young Prince is shortly to be made Deputy Governor of Kermanshah. The young man is, in my opinion, totally unfitted for either appointment.

I have, &c.

(Signed) H. GOUGH.

No. 139.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 259.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 5, 1905.

IN obedience to the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram No. 88 of the 29th ultimo, I addressed to the Persian Government the note, copy of which I have the honour to inclose, regarding the apology demanded by His Majesty's Government in consequence of the destruction of the buildings at Kuhak, formerly occupied by the Seistan Arbitration Commission.

After sending the inclosed note, I at once applied for an interview with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, but, probably owing to the absence of the Shah from Tehran, his Excellency has not yet replied to my letter. I shall, however, see him as usual on Wednesday next.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 139.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh.

(Translation.)

WITH reference to my note of the 16th instant, I have the honour to inform you that I have now received instructions from His Majesty's Government with regard to the apology required by them on account of the discourteous action of the Yamin-i-Nizam in burning down, without due notice being given to His Majesty's Consul in Seistan, the buildings lately occupied by the Seistan Arbitration Commission at Kuhak.

I am to demand that the principal local officials at Nasratabad—that is, the Deputy Governor, the Yamin-i-Nizam, and the Karguzar—call at an early date on His Majesty's Consul, and express their regret for the unwarrantable action involved in the demolition of the buildings in question.

I am to add that His Majesty's Government expect the Persian Government to re-erect the said buildings without delay.

If convenient to your Excellency, I would call on you at any hour you are pleased to name, and do my best to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of the matter.

November 30, 1905.

No. 140.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 25.)

(No. 261.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 7, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith copy of the usual monthly summary of events in Persia, which have not been recorded in separate despatches.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 140.

*Monthly Summary of Events.**Meshed.*

IN spite of the Grand Vizier's denial of the truth of the report, the transfer of the Persian portion of the Meshed Ashkhabad road to the Russians continues to be freely discussed in Meshed. The Rais-ul-Tajar, who holds the Concession, has been summoned to Tehran; and it is said that, whereas the Russian Bank had hitherto

refused all further loans to him, they have now advanced him a large sum. It is further said that by his Agreement with the Russian Bank he will continue to be a partner in the concern. However this may be, it is at least certain that repairs are shortly to be undertaken on the road, and a Russian and a Persian engineer, accompanied by a representative of the Customs, have left Meshed to estimate the cost of the work.

2. Major Sykes, His Majesty's Consul-General, left Meshed on the 24th October for a tour on the Perso-Afghan frontier. He will visit Karez in order to inquire into the circumstances of the Afghan wool trade, referred to in previous summaries.

3. M. Mousnikow, the Russian Consul-General, who has been absent on leave for nearly a year, arrived at Meshed on the 25th October and relieved M. Reschetov. He is not expected to remain very long at Meshed, and it is believed that M. Klemm, now Russian Consul-General at Bombay, has been appointed to succeed him. It is worth noting that M. Nekrassoff, who has just been appointed Russian Consul in Seistan, was M. Klemm's secretary in Bombay.

4. The movement of Cossacks backwards and forwards across the frontier continues. On the 12th November there were no fewer than forty-eight Cossacks in Meshed and six Russian Turcoman sowars.

5. A Russian engineer is reported to have left Meshed for Sabsewar on the 30th October.

6. Towards the end of October the parcels-post waggon was pillaged on the road near Kuchan.

7. Shortly after his arrival the Russian Consul-General sent to the Telegraph Office and made detailed inquiries about the working of the whole telegraph system, number of lines, number of offices, and which officers were served jointly by English, Russian, Armenian, and Persian clerks.

8. Traffic on the Trans-Caspian Railway has been frequently interrupted by strikes and disturbances along the line, the postal service has been disorganized, and a large number of pilgrims detained at Ashkhabad by the breakdown of communications with Baku.

9. It is said that the Asaf-ed-Dowleh's tenure of the post of Governor-General is very precarious, and that the Nazar-ed-Dowleh has been intriguing vigorously for his place. The Asaf has been doing his utmost to get written expressions of satisfaction from the various trades and from leading inhabitants, including the Russian Consul-General.

10. The Russians, in addition to clamouring for the settlement of their claims for damage done in the riots of last Moharrem (see last diary), are now complaining bitterly of the delay in settling outstanding claims in the Karguzari.

11. The Russian Bank continues to purchase land at Takkiabad, in the immediate neighbourhood of the city, and has just acquired a large plot of ground for the settlement of the Russian Armenian colony.

12. The Russians have asked permission to station a telegraphist at Sabsewar, but the Mushir-ed-Dowleh informed Mr. Grant Duff that the Shah had refused his consent.

Kerman.

Recent events in Kerman furnish a typical instance of the weakness and incompetence of the Central Government in its dealings with the provinces.

In the last summary it was reported how the struggle between the Sheikhli and Balasiri factions had culminated in a riot organized by the Balasiri faction: how the riot had been sternly suppressed by the local authorities, and its instigator, the leading Balasiri Mollah, beaten and expelled from the city. Such an unexpected exhibition of strength and common-sense raised hopes that, with the advent of the new Governor, the Zafar-es-Sultaneh, things had taken a turn for the better, especially as the Shah sent a telegram approving the action of the local authorities. His Majesty's Consul wrote that this strong attitude had had a salutary effect, and that if things were allowed to take their natural course, and there were no interference from outside, the power of the Mollahs would probably be weakened for ever.

For some time things remained quiet, the rival sects contenting themselves with playful badinage at one another's expense, the Balasiris driving a donkey dressed in a turban into the mosque, where the leading Sheikhli Mollah was preaching, and the Sheikhis retaliating by using the leading Balasiri Mollah's pulpit as a tribune.

Then the outside influences, whose action was anticipated and feared by the British Consul, began to work. A telegram was received from two Mujtehedes at Kerbela stigmatizing the Sheikh sect as unclean, and upholding the action of the bastinadoed Balasiri Mollah. Copies of this telegram were posted on the mosques and caravanserais, and agitation was once more in full swing. The Central Government, instead of seizing this opportunity of dealing a crushing blow at priestly prestige, collapsed miserably, and, in spite of the Shah's previous telegram of approval, dismissed the Governor.

One curious incident occurred during the disturbances. After the beating of the Balasiri Mollah a number of well-dressed women wished to send a message in English to the Shah, to the effect that if he did not do something to revenge the indignity offered to their Chief they would renounce him and become British subjects.

2. As an instance of the disaffection prevailing in the district, His Majesty's Consul cites a conversation which took place in an assembly of leading residents in Kerman, including officials from Tehran and elsewhere, in which the Shah was openly abused in no measured terms, the example of Russia referred to, and the possibility of a revolution freely discussed. Such conversation is said to be by no means uncommon, and Captain Harworth was even asked by the Persian soldiers of his own Consular guard whether the British Government would not do something to help them (see also under Tehran).

Tahran.

It is stated that Nizam-es-Sultaneh, Vazir of Azerbaijan, has sent in his resignation, but the Shah has not accepted it. The Nizam is a possible candidate for the post of Grand Vizier. If he persists in his desire to resign, he will be ordered to go to Mecca.

2. The Valiahd, since his return, is said to have shown himself to be more under Russian influence than ever. He was received by the Consular Corps, but almost ignored them altogether, devoting himself to a conversation in Russian with the Russian Inspector of Roads.

Shiraz.

The chaotic condition of the entire Province of Fars and the recent disturbances at Shiraz are fully dealt with elsewhere (see Mr. Grant Duff's despatches No. 254 of the 3rd December and No. 256 of the 5th December).

2. In spite of the improvements in the road-guards promised by the local authorities, the state of the roads throughout the province continues deplorable. Robberies are constant and shameless, the road-guards levy blackmail, or, if they recover stolen property, demand a heavy fee for its delivery, and the insecurity is so great that the whole traffic of the country is utterly disorganized. The stretch of the Bushire Road between Kazerun and Borasjan has an especially unenviable reputation.

Mr. Grant Duff has time after time, and each time in stronger language, represented to the Persian Government how intolerable this state of things is, and on every occasion is met by the usual vague assurances and promises, but nothing is ever done.

3. Shiraz merchants complain that there is a great falling off in the quantity of tea passing through Shiraz from the Gulf, the Isfahan and Tehran markets now being supplied by Russian merchants through the Caucasus.

Yezd.

Complaints of the levy of illegal dues on muleteers and caravans in the Yezd district still continue to reach His Majesty's Legation, in spite of the frequent representations made to the Persian Government and the assurances of their immediate discontinuance, which they never hesitate to give.

2. In the first week of December considerable alarm was created among the Christian population by the violent anti-Christian preaching of a fanatical Mollah. It appears that the trouble began by the expulsion of a boy from the Mission school for having circulated an indecent poem. The aggrieved youth appealed to the Mollahs,

and a small reign of terror was the result, the fanatical priest urging the people to attack the Mission school and murder the teachers and pupils. Mr. Grant Duff at once made urgent representations to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, who assured him that everything possible was being done to insure the safety of the Christians. The British Vice-Consul recommends that the Mollah be quietly removed to Tehran, and Mr. Grant Duff is addressing the Mushir-ed-Dowleh in this sense, but it is very doubtful whether his Excellency will be able to enforce such an order, even if he is willing to issue it.

Seistan.

The difficulties between the Karguzar and His Majesty's Consul, reported in the last summary, continue. The Karguzar has lodged a counter complaint against Captain Macpherson with his Government. Mr. Grant Duff, after going carefully into the correspondence, came to the conclusion that Captain Macpherson was entirely in the right, and there has been an exchange of somewhat sharply-worded notes on the subject.

2. There are signs of serious impending trouble on the frontier over the water question.

3. The Yamin-i-Nizam offered a rather shamefaced explanation to His Majesty's Consul for the burning of the Seistan Mission buildings. He said that he was acting under peremptory orders. Captain Macpherson is convinced that his action is largely to be ascribed to his desire to disprove the accusations of Anglophile tendencies levied against him.

4. His Majesty's Consul reports that the Kain-Seistan telegraph line is about to be repaired by the Russians.

5. His Majesty's Consul reports that the passport fees for British-Indian subjects have been raised. Mr. Grant Duff is inquiring into the matter. The whole question of passport fees formed the subject of correspondence between the Persian Government and Sir A. Hardinge in the early part of this year.

Tehran.

The chief feature of the month has been the growing agitation against the Grand Vizier and a general feeling of discontent against the present régime. A rather remarkable manifestation of this spirit has been the preaching in one of the principal mosques during Ramazan of Seyyid Jamal of Isfahan, who openly advocated in his sermons that Persia should be turned into a Republic. He supported his proposals by texts from the Koran. These sermons are stated to have made a profound impression on the large congregations that flocked to hear them.

Some of the principal Mollahs, including Seyyid Abdullah, are working hard to overthrow the Grand Vizier, and the latter's chances of successfully weathering the storm, are popularly supposed to be very small indeed. Most of the soldiers and officials all over Persia have not been paid for nearly a year, the finances are chaotic, the Treasury is empty, and the Customs Department, in order to carry on at all, have had to borrow a large sum from the Shah's private board.

There are rumours that one of the usual corners in grain is being engineered by high officials, and the price of bread is rising rapidly. Practically no rain has fallen yet, and unless it comes soon the prospects for the spring crops will be very bad indeed.

The destruction of a branch of the Russian Bank in the bazaar by a mob of Seyyids and students (reported to Foreign Office in telegram No. 160 of the 27th November) was expected to be a preliminary to further disturbances directed against the Grand Vizier, but though there are evidences of a spirit of unrest in the city, nothing further has, so far, occurred. The Russians profess to consider the incident of little importance, and are believed to be content in themselves with demanding pecuniary compensation for the actual damage done.

Early in December the Khalij regiment, which was encamped near Tehran, demanded arrears of pay. Part of the regiment took "bust" in the Grand Vizier's house, and refused to leave till his Highness personally gave the assurance that pay would be given them through the Ameer Khan Sirdar.

Much amusement is being caused in Tehran by the fact that the only Russian

telegraphist here has gone out on solitary strike. He is an old man who has been in Tehran for twenty-five years and had no wish to strike, but orders came to him over the wires to join the general movement in Russia under pain of various disabilities in future, and he is accordingly making his little isolated demonstration.

(Signed) G. JARDINE KIDSTON.

Matters dealt with in separate Despatches and Telegrams.

Matters dealt with.	No. and Date.
Seristan water award	Despatch No. 257 of December 5. Telegram No. 151 of November 17.
Seristan Mission buildings	Despatch No. 259 of December 4. Telegram No. 153 of November 18.
Condition of Fars	Despatch No. 254 of December 3. Telegram No. 155 of November 20.
Insecurity of roads in Southern Persia	" No. 159 of November 24. Despatch No. 256 of December 5.
Yezd anti-Christian agitation	Telegram No. 162 of November 30. " No. 166 of December 2.
Proposed Persian loan	" No. 164 of December 1. Despatch No. 250 of December 2.
Recruiting of Berberis at Meshed	" No. 251 of December 2.
Persian proposal for withdrawal of Consular guards	" No. 252 of December 2.
Situation in Persia	" No. 253 of December 2.
Honjam-Bander Abbas Telegraph Line	Telegram No. 167 of December 3.
Bukhara road	Despatch No. 255 of December 4.
Urmí inquiry	" No. 258 of December 5.
Douglas and Lockyer outrage	" No. 260 of December 5.
Mohammereh-Ahvaz telegraphic communication	"

No. 141.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne. — (Received December 23.)

(No. 262.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 7, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 81 of the 10th ultimo, and to my telegram No. 150 of the 10th ultimo, I have the honour to state that during the last two years both Sir A. Hardinge and myself have repeatedly tried to induce the Persian Government to come to a reasonable understanding as regards the status of Bahreinis in this country. On receipt of the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram No. 81, I again discussed the question with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, and did my best to induce his Excellency to allow His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire to exercise his good offices on behalf of the subjects of the Sheikh of Bahrein. In view of the Shah's contention that Bahrein is part of his dominions, and the people of that island his subjects, it was impossible for me to come to any satisfactory settlement. In obedience to your Lordship's instructions I declined to discuss the Shah's claims.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh eventually informed me that the Persian Government had decided to instruct Ahas-Sultaneh to communicate directly with your Lordship on the subject.

I submit that the attitude of the Persian Government has produced a deadlock, and that further discussion of the question here is unlikely to serve any useful purpose.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

No. 142.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne. — (Received December 23.)

(No. 263.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 239 of the 5th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit correspondence with the Grand Vizier regarding the Majid-es-Sultaneh and Agha Mirza Hassan, the Urmí Mujtehed.

Your Lordship will see that I have arranged that, while His Majesty's Government will no longer press for the fulfilment of the assurances given to Sir Arthur Hardinge that the Mujtehed would be removed either to Tehran or Meshed, the Persian Government on their part guarantee that the Majid-es-Sultaneh and his property shall not be molested, and that the Mujtehed shall remain at Tabreez.

In spite of our verbal agreement, I have had the greatest trouble in keeping the Grand Vizier to his promise to furnish me with a written guarantee. His Highness at first tried to put me off with a note, the terms of which were so vague that I declined to accept it, and it was only to-day, after a struggle lasting several weeks, that I obtained a satisfactory reply to my communication of the 13th ultimo.

The Majid-es-Sultaneh, who, rightly or wrongly, thinks that even a written undertaking from the Grand Vizier will not protect him from the Valiabd's wrath, is still in "bast" at His Majesty's Consulate-General at Tabreez. The telegram from His Majesty's Acting Consul-General, periphrase of which I inclose, would appear to show that the Valiabd is adopting a more conciliatory attitude in regard to him.

In order still further to protect the Majid, I have approved Mr. Wratislaw's proposal to appoint him Mirza of the Consulate-General. This, combined with the Grand Vizier's note, should, I think, make his position as secure as anything can be in Persia.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure 1 in No. 142.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Atabeg-i-Azam.

(Translation.)

November 13, 1905.

AS you are aware, the Majid-es-Sultaneh has been for some time in "bast" at His Majesty's Consulate-General at Tabreez. In the conversation which I had the honour to have with your Highness on Saturday, the 4th November, it was verbally agreed that the Persian Government would furnish me with a written guarantee to the effect that, should the Majid-es-Sultaneh be induced to leave the British Consulate-General, both he and his property should remain unmolested, both at present and in the future. On my part, I promised that His Majesty's Government would not, if the above guarantee were given, continue to press for the fulfilment of the assurances given by the Persian Government to Sir A. Hardinge that the Urmí Mollah, Haji Mirza Hussein Agha, would be removed either to Tehran or Meshed. I gave this promise on the express condition that the said Mollah shall be kept at Tabreez, and that adequate precautions shall be taken to prevent him from interfering with local affairs at Urmí, more especially with the trial of the Kurds accused of the murder of Mr. Labaree and of shooting at Captain Gough.

I accordingly await your Highness' written guarantee regarding the Majid-es-Sultaneh.

Inclosure 2 in No. 142.

Atabeg-i-Azam to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Translation.)

November 25, 1905.

I HAVE received your note of the 13th instant, respecting the Majid-es-Sultaneh and Agha Mirza Hassan Mujtehed. In reply I have the honour to inform you that, as it was verbally arranged, I hereby state in writing that when the Majid-es-Sultaneh leaves the Consulate-General no one will unjustly interfere with him, and that his life and property, like those of other Persian subjects, will be protected against all injuries

and molestation. Indeed, the proceedings of the Majid-es-Sultaneh were from the first a matter of surprise, since, by the help of the Almighty, and under the protection of His Imperial Majesty, no one dares nowadays to encroach on the rights of others, or to unjustly molest any one. The Persian officials never allow any one to be subject to cruelty or oppression. The Majid-es-Sultaneh can rest assured and at ease.

With regard to your statement that the departure of the Muhtehed from Tabreez will not be pressed or mentioned again, I have to inform you that if from the beginning careful inquiries had been made as to his peaceful intentions, innocence, and the improbability of his being the cause of suspicion, such representations would not have been made. In renewing to you the assurances of my friendship, and expressing my thanks to you, I have to inform you that, for the present and until it be suitable, Mirza Hussein Agha will not be allowed to go to Urmī.

Inclosure 3 in No. 142.

Acting Consul-General Stevens to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tabreez, November 30, 1905.

THE Secretary of the Karguzar was sent yesterday morning to inform me that the Valiud had agreed that the Majid-es-Sultaneh should be allowed to proceed to Tiflis, and that his two Kurdish servants, mentioned in my telegram No. 6, would be set free.

Later on I had an audience with the Valiud, and conveyed your message, for which he thanks you and sends his compliments, and says that the memory of his last interview with you is a very pleasant one.

He said that the Majid's affairs would shortly be settled, and that he would allow him to depart.

No. 143.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 265.)

My Lord,

Tehran, December 8, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inclose a copy of a report addressed by His Majesty's Consul at Bander Abbas to His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire, regarding a rumour which seems to be current in South Persia that the Russian Government have succeeded in obtaining a long lease of the Island of Kishm.

I have no reason to think that there is any truth in the story.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Inclosure in No. 143.

Report by Consul Shakespear, forwarded by Consul-General Cox.

ONE thing that seems to have a very firm hold of all this part of the Gulf is that the Russian Government have managed to extract a long lease of Kishm Island out of the Persians. I have noted it in my diary.

The story is as follows, and I heard it substantially the same at Lingah, at Kishm (from Sheikh Hassan himself), and here in Bander Abbas: Whilst the Shah was in Europe, the Russian Government convinced him of the immense benefit likely to accrue to him and his country from railways. They said they would help him with the building, &c., of them, but could not afford to do so without some guarantee for the expense; that as the customs were mortgaged up to the hilt they required something else, and asked for the lease of some port on the Gulf. The Shah apparently thought that that was going a little too far, so the Russians then suggested an island, and selected Kishm. The story goes that as the Moin-ut-Tajjar was also in Europe at the time, the Russians had sounded him beforehand, so that when the Shah came to consult him (as at present he leases Kishm from the Persian Government) there was no opposition whatever, and that, in fact, there

has really been a deal done over the island. My arguments that the revenues of Kishm (some 3,000 tomans) were not worth much as a guarantee was met with the reply that the Russians were prepared to accept a small guarantee in exchange for the extra influence they would acquire as owners of Kishm.

The story seems impossible, but it is very widely known, and I was frequently asked if it was true. Our joining up Henjam and Bander Abbas by a telegraph line is considered a countermove, and at Kishm Sheikh Hassan could not make out how we had arranged to build a telegraph line across the island if it was Russian. This was the very argument I used to show him how groundless the report must be, but he was not convinced a bit, and kept on wondering how we had fixed it up with the Russians.

I also hear, though here in Bander Abbas only, that Kishm Town is to be used as a Russian coal depôt, and that Kishm Island was the price of another big loan, said to be 2,700,000 roubles or rupees.

You may be able to get some confirmation of the story in Bushire, though it really seems beyond belief that there can be a grain of truth in it.

(Signed) W. H. I. SHAKESPEAR.

Bander Abbas, October 25, 1905.

No. 144.

Mr. Spring-Rice to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 772.)

Sir,

St. Petersburg, December 16, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Grant Duff's telegram No. 164 of the 1st instant, on the subject of the financial condition of Persia, I have the honour to state that I had some conversation to-day with the Persian Minister here on this matter. He acknowledged that the Persian Government was in a situation of some embarrassment with regard to its finances, but he told me that he had recently received a telegram from the Grand Vizier, stating that an immediate loan was not required, as the proposed reorganization of the army and Administration would not be carried out at once. He assured me that no negotiations were being carried on through him, and that he did not believe the Russian Government had much confidence in M. Speyer, the Russian Minister in Tehran, who had recently been summoned to St. Petersburg. With regard to the general question of an advance of money to meet the requirements of the Persian Government, he stated that M. Vlassow, the late Russian Minister at Tehran, had urged the Persian Government to accept a Russian Controller in return for a loan, and that the Grand Vizier had refused to accept such a condition. M. Vlassow had insisted that Turkey, which was a great Power, had accepted a similar condition in the form of the International Commissioners of the Debt, and that her independence had not suffered. The Persian Government, however, had steadily objected, on the ground that the appointment of a sole Russian Controller would lead to the loss of independence. While accepting the justice of this view, the Persian Minister observed that a loan without some form of control would only lead to the ruin of Persia, as the money would be spent on subsidies to favourites without any advantage to the State. He hoped some day to see his country have recourse to Europe in general, and not to Russia or England, for financial aid, especially for the construction of railways; and he complained bitterly of the jealousy between the two countries, which made it, he said, impossible for his country to develop its resources as other countries had done, by improving the means of communication.

With regard to the relations between England and Russia, while expressing the hope that they would improve, as such an improvement would be of the greatest service to Persia, he did not, he said, believe that Russia would ever consent to sign a Treaty with England with regard to Persia, such as had been agreed on by England and France with regard to Siam. Long years were, he thought, necessary before the views of Russia would change to that extent. At the present moment it would be a mistake to suppose that the interest of Russia in Persia had slackened. The failure of Russia's attempt to obtain an access to warm water in the Far East could only result in increasing her desire to obtain command of a port in the South. On the other hand, the state of internal politics, the recent lesson in Manchuria, and, above all, the Anglo-Japanese Treaty would act as formidable deterrents. On the whole, he thought that

Russia would remain quiescent as regards Persia for some time to come, and he hoped that this period would be utilized by Persia in reforming herself, and by Russia and England in arriving at a friendly understanding. Count Lamsdorff had, he said, expressed himself in a similar sense on a recent occasion. The Minister quoted the words used by his Excellency, which were: "We want to remain quiet in Persia, and will do so, as long as you make no *bêtises*."

It is, of course, possible that overtures are now being made here with a view to a Russian loan to Persia on condition of the acceptance of Russian financial control; but, if so, the language of the Persian Minister is hard to reconcile with such a fact, as he spoke in strong language as to the difficulty which a foreign Controller, acting alone, would have in facing the instinct of independence ingrained in the Persian people.

I have, &c.
(Signed) CECIL SPRING-RICE.

No. 145.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received December 23.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 22nd December, relative to the proposed further loan to the Persian Government.

India Office, December 23, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 145.

Government of India to Mr. Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P.

December 22, 1905.

PERSIAN Loan.—Your Secret telegram of 14th December.

Unless the Persian Government grant further substantial political and commercial concessions, we are not prepared to make loan on conditions suggested by them. We are considering what specific concessions of the above nature should be sought, and will report further by telegraph. We assume that, as on previous occasion, Imperial Government will at least guarantee jointly any loan that may be made. Decision now communicated was arrived at after discussion in Council.

Finance Member dissents from proposal that any further loan should be made by revenues of India. All other members concurred.

No. 146.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 23, 1905.

I AM directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a telegram from His Majesty's Charge d'Affaires at Tehran, reporting on the situation in Persia, and recommending that the guard of His Majesty's Legation should be increased to fifty men.

I am to suggest, for Mr. Morley's consideration, that a telegram should be addressed to the Government of India, warning them of this proposal, and inquiring how soon the men could be made ready to start to Tehran.

I am, &c.
(Signed) R. GORST.

No. 147.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 24.)

(No. 180.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 24, 1905.

FOLLOWING telegram repeated to Government of India:—

"I received a confidential message yesterday from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, informing me that Governor-General, who is now in Paris, will not return to Shiraz, and that the Deputy Governor of Pars is to be replaced by a special official. I trust that this will put an end to disturbances; the situation, however, is still critical according to the latest reports which I have received."

No. 148.

Sir N. O'Connor to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 25.)

(No. 921. Secret.)

Sir,

Constantinople, December 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my immediately preceding despatch, I have the honour to forward to you herewith copy of a despatch which I have received from Colonel H. C. Surtees, Military Attaché to the Embassy, respecting the movement of Ottoman troops towards the Persian frontier.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONNOR.

Inclosure in No. 148.

Colonel Surtees to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 70. Secret.)

Sir,

Constantinople, December 16, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inform you that, in accordance with the terms of an Iradé issued on the 11th instant, telegrams have been dispatched to the Valis of Erzeroum, Diarbekr, and Mossul, ordering them to use every means in their power to accelerate the movement to the district of Wazna of the following troops:

- IV Corps—
 - 8 Battalions of infantry.
 - 4 Batteries of mountain guns.
 - 4 Regiments of Hamidieh cavalry.
 - (These to be selected from the Mosul and Jezire Regiments.)
- VI Corps—
 - 1 Regiment of infantry.
 - 1 Mountain battery.

The announced object of the movement is to insure the safety of the detachments under the command of Liwa Izzet Pasha, which are watching the frontier.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. CONYERS SURTEES,
Military Attaché.

No. 149.

Sir N. O'Connor to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 25.)

(No. 924.)

Sir,

Constantinople, December 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 914 of the 12th instant, I have the honour to report that His Highness Prince Mirza Riza Khan, the Persian Ambassador, called on me yesterday evening and reminded me of the advice which I had given him on the occasion of his previous visit, and which was to endeavour to settle the difficulties that had arisen in connection with the Turco-Persian frontier amicably with the Porte.

and to urge his Government to avoid any action calculated to increase the existing tension between the two countries and tend towards a breach of the peace. He added that he had repeated what I had said to him to the Russian Ambassador, whose advice had likewise been to the same effect.

The object of His Highness' present visit was to communicate to me a note, which he had received from the Porte on the 14th instant, and which was to the effect that Wazna (Vazneh), Eshidjan, and Pessweh are the summer pasturages of Ottoman nomad tribes inhabiting the Kazas of Sulcimanie, Rania, Shehr Bazar, and Mamoureti Hamid and indubitably form part of the Ottoman dominions, as do also Mirghian and Kulu Sheikh, a point which is proved, beyond possibility of contestation, by the fact that a Turkish Mudir formerly resided at Wazna and levied State taxes there; that the Persians are continually encroaching on these districts and have recently collected 5,000 or 6,000 troops in the neighbourhood of Pessweh, thereby compelling the Ottoman Government to resort to similar measures; that in order to give proofs of its conciliatory disposition the latter had nevertheless consented to the nomination of a joint Commission of Inquiry, its Delegates on which were already designated, and would undertake to withdraw its troops from any point which the investigations of this Commission might show to be on Persian territory, but that it could not possibly consent to order the withdrawal of such troops as a measure preliminary to the inquiry.

Prince Mirza Riza Khan went on to narrate to me the various phases of his negotiations with the Porte during the past few weeks.

His Government, as I was aware, had at first declined to assent to the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry unless the Ottoman Government first consented to withdraw its troops from the disputed points, which it had hastened to occupy. The matter had been the subject of discussion before the Council of Ministers, which had twice come to an unfavourable decision, but on the third occasion had reported in favour of appointing a Commission. The Sultan had thereupon sanctioned the nomination of his Commissioners, and had invited the Persian Government to do the same, but he had categorically refused to order the withdrawal of his troops before the decision of the Commission was made known, and had, on the contrary, directed that a Turkish force, equal in numbers to that which the Persians had assembled, should be hurried forward and should be maintained on the frontier until the opposing force was itself withdrawn.

His Highness added that he had been confidentially informed that the Sultan based his refusal on the ground that he had yielded to the request of the English Ambassador under similar circumstances in connection with the Aden delimitation and had in consequence lost a considerable strip of territory.

He considered that he had already gained a good deal in securing the Sultan's consent to the nomination of a Commission, and told me that, in case I shared this view, he would be very grateful if I would inform His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran of my opinion, as the Russian Ambassador had already done, since he knew the influence which this would have upon his Government. His own object was to arrive at an amicable settlement, since he was well aware that his Government had neither the military nor the pecuniary resources to enable it to oppose a successful resistance to Turkey in the event of hostilities.

I told the Ambassador that I knew that about nine battalions, with a considerable force of cavalry and artillery, had been ordered to the frontier, and that I thought he should do everything in his power to prevent an armed conflict, which might very easily assume dangerous proportions with so many unruly tribes on the Turkish side anxious to be allowed to raid the Province of Azerbaïdjan. I said that I would communicate with the Russian Ambassador, and saw no objection to my telegraphing to His Majesty's Legation at Tehran in a similar sense to M. Zinoviev.

Mirza Riza Khan replied that this would greatly strengthen his hands, since his Government appeared to think that he ought to have been able to induce the Turks to withdraw their troops from the territory in dispute, whereas he himself, understanding the difficulty of dealing with the Sultan, was of opinion that he had been very successful in securing the consent of His Majesty to a course which, in the earlier stages of the negotiations, he had absolutely refused to sanction.

His Highness concluded by saying that he would let me know as soon as he had heard from his Government whether he was authorized to accept the present proposal of the Porte.

There is ample material in this dispute to lead to serious events, but if, as seems probable, the Persian Government decides without delay to accept the Porte's present

proposal it may be hoped that complications will be avoided, for I hardly expect the Turks will assume an aggressive attitude without direct provocation, however much the neighbouring tribes, conscious of their power, may be anxious to do so.

I informed you by telegraph this evening of the position of affairs and of the advice I had given the Persian Ambassador, and I repeated my telegram to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 150.

India Office to Foreign Office. (Received December 25.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Morley, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 23rd December, relative to the telegraph station at Henjam.

A reply to the Foreign Office letter of the 15th instant on this subject will follow.

India Office, December 23, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 150.

Government of India to Mr. Morley.

(Telegraphic.) P.

December 23, 1905.

HENJAM. Telegram dated 15th instant from Grant Duff.

Reply is that, to enable the station to exist, there must have been land attached to it; facts also of possession between 1868 and 1880 are fully known, and are not disputed. The fields and wells, moreover, still exist, and are occupied by the station.

In view of the extreme vagueness of the original permit, the action which was actually taken upon it must furnish the explanation of its meaning.

(Repeated to Tehran)

No. 151

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey. (Received December 26.)

(No. 181.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 26, 1905.

TURCO-PERSIAN frontier dispute.

Sir N. O'Connor's telegram No. 211 of the 18th December.

Persian Government are willing to accept proposed arrangement, provided disputed territory is first evacuated by Turkish troops. Minister for Foreign Affairs trusts that, in view of note of March 1865 to the Porte (see Hertslet, p. 215), His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople will press the matter.

No. 152.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey. (Received December 27.)

(No. 182.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 27, 1905.

FOLLOWING telegram also sent to Government of India:—

"My telegram No. 179 of the 22nd December.

"I do not think further steps beyond arrangements to send guard necessary at present. We should probably have timely warning here of disturbances, which would be sure to commence in Tabreez and Meshed.

[1598]

2-1

"Unless situation here becomes critical, it is not advisable to send guard, as this would annoy the Shah, and the attitude of the Persian Government is already very obstructive.

"It should be borne in mind that a force could not reach Tehran for at least two months.

"I recommend scheme for sending force up without delay, if necessary, as transport would have to be supplied.

"I do not think that there is ill feeling against Europeans among the Persians, but one cannot tell what might happen, if the Government were to collapse or massacre of Armenians took place.

"In view of the fact that it is being said in the bazaars that England is trying to make trouble in Persia, we should act with extreme caution."

No. 153.

Foreign Office to India Office

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 28, 1905.

WITH reference to my letters of the 22nd, 23rd, and 26th instant, forwarding telegraphic correspondence with His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Tehran relative to the state of Persia, and the measures to be taken for the protection of British residents, I am directed by Secretary Sir Edward Grey to suggest, for the consideration of Mr. Secretary Morley, that, in view of Mr. Grant Duff's telegram No. 182 of the 26th instant, it is unnecessary to dispatch additional guards at once to Tehran.

Sir E. Grey would, however, propose, if Mr. Morley concurs, that Mr. Grant Duff should be instructed by telegraph to concert with the Government of India and His Majesty's Consul-General at Bushire as to the best means of insuring that a force should be available for dispatch to Tehran, or any other part of Persia, with the least possible delay, in the event of such a measure being rendered necessary by disturbances or other causes.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GREY.

No. 154.

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to the Persian Minister in London. (Communicated by the Persian Minister, December 28.)

(Translation)
(Telegraphic.)

[Undated.]

THERE has been a public demonstration in Shiraz against the Jews, and the Imperial Government have been and are taking steps to restore order and security, and security will soon be restored. During the disturbances the Jews had been interfered with, and preventative measures were taken, and while these measures were being taken several Mussulmans were shot at and a Jewess was accidentally wounded. The British Consul made this a reason for sending all the Jews into the house of M. Veneziani, an Italian subject who is at the head of the Jewish school in that city, and has placed the Indian cavalry of the Consulate around M. Veneziani's house for their protection, notwithstanding that all these Jews are Persian subjects and M. Veneziani is an Italian subject, who is reported throughout Persia for his misdeeds. The British Legation also wrote this account to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; a reply was sent stating that the Imperial Government have been and are doing their utmost to restore order there, and have specially appointed guards for the Jews, and the Legation were urgently requested to give instructions that the Indian cavalry should be immediately withdrawn from around the Italian's house, and that should anything be done to the contrary the responsibility of any unpleasant event that may take place will rest with the Consul, who without cause has acted outside the sphere of his duty in posting cavalry around the Italian's house and in collecting the Jews there. You will at once seek an interview with the Marquess of Lansdowne, and having drawn his Lordship's attention to this matter you will say that these Jews are all Persian subjects, and the Imperial Government have done and are doing everything for their security and protection. What cause is there for the British Consul to act thus outside the sphere

of his function and against the maintenance of order and tranquillity of that place? You will as soon as possible explain these facts to his Lordship so that a telegram may be sent that the cavalry should at once be removed from around M. Veneziani's house as it is possible that it may cause mischief, and should any mischief be done its responsibility will rest with the Consul who has taken this unnecessary step. You will telegraph as soon as possible the result of the steps which you will be taking. You know yourself that such things have happened and are happening in all parts of the world; indeed, at the present moment in Russia not a day passes without thousands of them being killed, and no steps have been taken by the British or other Governments. In Shiraz, where a trifling incident has taken place, and notwithstanding the strong measures which have been taken and are being taken by the Government to maintain order and to keep them in security, the Consul takes such unwarrantable steps. Surely the British Government will not approve of this unfriendly action of the Consul.

No. 155.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 184.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 28, 1905.

THE Persian Minister called to-day and communicated a telegram from the Mushir-ed-Dowleh, copy of which is inclosed herewith, on the subject of the measures taken by the Persian Government to calm the agitation among the population of Shiraz.

He said that it would be most unfortunate if, in consequence of an exaggerated idea of the state of affairs, you should persuade His Majesty's Government to send soldiers to that town.

He was informed that your impressions were derived from the reports of His Majesty's Consul on the spot, but that you seemed now to be somewhat reassured, and that in any case you were averse to any hasty action in the way of the dispatch of troops.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

No. 156.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey. (Received December 28.)

(No. 183.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 28, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

"My telegram No. 180 of the 26th December.

"All the Heads of Missions here have received a telegram from the people of Shiraz, enumerating their grievances and begging the foreign Representatives to lay them before the Shah.

"I have instructed His Majesty's Consul at Shiraz to inform the senders that I have received their message, and that it has been referred to the Mushir-ed-Dowleh by me."

No. 157.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey. (Received December 30.)

(No. 186.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 30, 1905.

FOLLOWING repeated to India:—

"Lord Lansdowne's telegram No. 93 of the 8th December.

"I am informed by His Majesty's Consul in Seistan that he has not yet received any apology for the burning of the Seistan Mission buildings. The Mushir-ed-Dowleh

maintains that the Deputy Governor has been instructed to apologize, but if this is true, he has not obeyed his instructions.

"We ought surely to insist that the Governor, accompanied by the person guilty of burning the buildings, should call in uniform and make his apology. Unless this is done no effect will be produced by the apology."

No. 158.

Mr. E. Grant Duff to Sir Edward Grey.—(*Received December 31.*)

(No. 187.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Tehran, December 31, 1905.

FOLLOWING addressed to India to-day:—

"Your telegram of the 18th December does not make it quite clear to me whether you wish to bring the arms for Meshed across the Persian frontier. The Persian Government will most certainly refuse permission to do so, and if it is intended to bring the arms in, irrespective of their permission, I would suggest that sending them direct to Meshed would be both better and quicker."

No. 159.

Sir Edward Grey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 485.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 31, 1905.

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 924 of the 18th instant, reporting a conversation with the Persian Ambassador at Constantinople regarding the Turco-Persian frontier dispute.

I approve your language to Prince Mirza Reza Khan on this subject.

I am, &c.

(Signed) EDWARD GREY.

No. 160.

Sir Edward Grey to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

(No. 182.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, December 31, 1905.

I HAVE received your despatch addressed to my predecessor, No. 255 of the 4th instant, on the subject of the Urumia murders.

I approve your action in declining to associate yourself in any suggestion for the employment of torture.

I am, &c.

(Signed) EDWARD GREY.